

The **HISTORICAL BULLETIN**

Vol. XXX, No. 2

January, 1952



From Enemy to Ally, a Survey of Anglo-French Relations	67
Herbert Weinschel	
Aquinas: Mediaeval Historian	85
R. Ignatius Burns	
Historical Analysis of Modern Judaism	99
William Lester	
Reviews of Books	107
(see inside front cover)	
Current Bibliography	123

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY PRESS

50 cents a copy

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a year

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A Service Quarterly for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXX

January, 1952

No. 2

Editor

LOWRIE J. DALY

Editorial Board

John Francis Bannon

Laurence J. Kenny

Thomas L. Coonan

Daniel D. McGarry

Jasper W. Cross

Thomas P. Neill

Anthony F. Czajkowski

Paul G. Steinbicker

Joseph P. Donnelly

Edward R. Vollmar

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Hans Lietzmann, <i>From Constantine to Julian</i>	107
<i>Anales de Historia Antigua y Medieval</i>	108
John Hall Stewart, <i>A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution</i>	109
Donald Greer, <i>The Incidence of Emigration During the French Revolution</i>	109
Jere Clemens King, <i>Generals and Politicians</i>	109
Edward Mead Earle, <i>Modern France</i>	109
Hubert Becher, <i>Die Jesuiten: Geschichte und Gestalt des Ordens</i>	111
Robert S. Harper, <i>Lincoln and the Press</i>	114
Henry Steele Commager, <i>The Blue and the Gray</i>	115
William B. Hesseltine, <i>Confederate Leaders in the New South</i>	116
James C. Malin, <i>Grassland Historical Studies</i>	118
Albert H. Kneale, <i>Indian Agent</i>	120
Munro Leaf, <i>History Can Be Fun</i>	120
Edgar B. Wesley, <i>Teaching Social Studies in High Schools</i>	121

FROM ENEMY TO ALLY

A Survey of Anglo-French Relations

HERBERT WEINSCHEL, PH.D.

INTRODUCTION

We are wont to think of France and England as allies. Yet during by far the longest period of their relations these two states were not only not allies, but outright enemies. It is only since the early years of the twentieth century that they have become allies and it was only 135 years ago that they ceased to be enemies, i.e., that they have not fought against each other. Why did these two important states of Europe become enemies, why did they remain enemies for most of the time, what were the circumstances that made them bury the hatchet, and what were the events that brought them together as allies? These are interesting questions because we find no duplication of these changes in the relations of any other of the European states.

In order to answer these questions adequately, i.e., to provide an understanding of the developments affecting the relations of these two states, it appears necessary to trace their relations from the beginning to the present day. Such an undertaking might be worth-while. However, the attempt to cover such a topic within brief compass may be regarded as too ambitious a program. But unless the *whole* period of their relations is considered, it is not possible to gain a clear picture of the developments referred to above and an understanding of the changes that have taken place in their attitude to each other. Any limitation in matters of time would break up the continuous story and impair the understanding of the underlying events. On the other hand, an account—however brief—of the *whole* history of Anglo-French relations will aid in gaining a better understanding of the developments involved. The problem of limitations of space can be solved by dealing with the first six centuries (1066-1688) in a rather cursory fashion and giving a somewhat broader account of the later periods, while on the whole concentrating on major trends only, will provide the necessary clarification of aims and policies involved. Such a survey will make it possible to discover certain patterns and to draw conclusions in regard to policies which have guided the two states in their relations to each other.

I. The First Six Centuries of Contact (1066-1688)

The first time that we can find a contact established between England and France is the era of William the Conqueror (1066-1087) who as Duke of Normandy conquered England and combined the crown of England with his Duchy in a personal union. As Duke of Normandy he was a vassal of the king of France and as such owed him allegiance as his "overlord." But since the king of France was weak and William of Normandy strong, he was practically independent in his Duchy. The Capet dynasty had been elevated to the royal dignity only in 987, and although 500 years later the French king was practically absolute, their tenure of office in William's time had been too brief and the early Capetian kings had been too weak to strengthen their position. France was at that time and for some time to come a typical feudal monarchy with the holder of the title of "king" being hardly more than a *primus inter pares* in relation to his vassals and sometimes not even that, particularly when some of his "vassals" were more powerful and had more territory under their direct control than the "king" himself.

This was especially true when about a century after the Conqueror his great-grandson, Henry II Plantagenet (1154-1189), one of England's greatest kings, by combining the lands which he had inherited in France from both his mother Matilda and his father Geoffrey of Anjou and which, in addition, he had acquired by his marriage, controlled directly almost two-thirds of France. This he held as "vassal" of the "king" of France while the king himself—at that time still confined mainly to the *Île de France*, the Capetians' original domain—exercised direct authority only over one-sixth of France. Henry II, who not only controlled most of France but also held almost absolute sway over England, was not tempted by his extraordinarily powerful position to take advantage of his situation in his relation to the "king" of France, but remained a loyal "vassal" of his (so much weaker) king for his French territories. Yet his loyalty could not eliminate the distortion in terms of power that existed between the "vassal" and his suzerain, the "king"; it made it possibly even more grotesque. Hence, it was to be expected that a continuation of this situation would be regarded as intolerable by the first French king who would show strength of personality, and that such a king would be determined to reverse the balance in his favor, to strengthen his authority at the expense of his most powerful

vassal—at that time the king of England—by depriving that vassal of a considerable amount of his lands, and, if possible, to free French soil from his control altogether. Of course the latter eventuality appeared feasibly only if a *strong* French king would be opposed by an *extremely weak* English king.

The French king who had the strength to embark upon such an ambitious undertaking was Philip II Augustus (1180-1223) who was somewhat a French replica of the—actually also French—Henry II of England, and who proved the nemesis of the Angevin kings. His aims were exactly those outlined above, and he had laid his plans well to achieve them. He did not wait for the death of the great English king, but as soon as he succeeded to the royal title, he went into action by allying himself with the weak, but ambitious sons against their aging father Henry II, thus dividing and undermining cunningly the strength of the English monarchy. And when grief over the civil war in which his sons had engaged him hastened the death of the great king, Philip Augustus abruptly turned against his recent ally, Richard I (1189-1199) known as the Lionhearted, the volatile son and successor of Henry II, and engaged him in almost continuous war.

But it was not until Richard's younger brother John (1199-1216) succeeded him upon his death that Philip Augustus achieved his complete triumphs and saw his widest dreams come true. Due to the fact that at a time, when one of the strongest kings in her history held the crown of France, the most pitiful specimen of a ruler held the throne across the Channel, Philip Augustus succeeded in expelling John from his most prized possessions on the soil of France. By 1104 John had lost to Philip practically half of the magnificent Norman-Angevin inheritance, including the proud stem duchy of Normandy.

The situation was now completely reversed. Within a short fifteen years after the death of Henry II, who by inheritance and marriage had accumulated more territory in France than any English king before or after him and—though a loyal “vassal”—had rendered grotesque the relationship between himself and his suzerain, Philip Augustus was able to gain direct control over the most valuable of these lands and thereby laid the foundations upon which some of his strong successors in the centuries to follow were to erect the absolute French monarchy.

The English kings, however, did not consider their cause lost. From then on they would concentrate on attempts to regain the

lands surrendered through the stupidity and incompetence of John Lackland. The situation became stabilized when by the Peace of Paris (1259) Louis IX of France (1226-1270) and John's son and successor Henry III (1216-1272) compromised their respective claims, and Henry was left in control of all of southwestern France, though the other Norman-Angevin possessions remained lost. But when the Capetian dynasty became extinct in the male line in 1328, the new king of England Edward III (1327-1377) laid claim to the French crown through his mother; this claim, however, was not considered valid by the French lawyers, because, according to the so-called Salic Law, succession could only be transmitted through the male line of a dynasty and not through a female descendant. The jurists, therefore, adjudged as valid the claim of the French Valois—though not a direct line. Here Edward III contested the French throne with Philip VI of Velois.

It was Edward's aim to unite the English with the French crown under his personal rule, and his determination to achieve his ambition led to the so-called Hundred Years' War (1337-1453) between England and France which we might call here the First Hundred Years' War. For most of the time the English king held the upper hand, enjoying as he did the support of powerful French vassals, such as the mighty Duke of Burgundy; and during the reign of Henry VI the English came very close in uniting permanently the crowns of England and France. It was mainly the appearance of the marvellous Joan of Arc in 1429 which is credited by historians with turning the tide—a tide that was ever rising against the English until by 1453 they were cleared out from the continent except for the French city of Calais which remained in their possession until 1558. The issue, whether the king of England or the king of France should rule over France, was finally decided in favor of the latter; and never again did an English king attempt to set foot as an invader on French soil.

The final victory of the French king strengthened royal authority and paved the way for the consolidation of his power and for the establishment of an absolute, national monarchy under the centralized rule of the king, extending over all of France. Although the achievement of full absolutism was not consummated until the time of Henry IV (1589-1610) and Cardinal Richelieu (1624-1642), that is only after the French monarchy had weathered the storm of the protracted domestic religious wars (1562-

1593), yet the foundations for the ultimate attainment of absolute rule were laid in the final stage¹ of, and in the half-century following, the First Hundred Years' War.

The same results which victory had for the French monarchy, defeat also eventually had for the English monarchy. But England had first to overcome the period of civil wars, commonly known as the Wars of the Roses, which followed closely upon the First Hundred Years' War and lasted until 1485. The ultimate victor in these struggles, Henry VII Tudor (1485-1509) established a strong monarchy. The English kings now limited in their ambitions to English territory, could devote their full attention to consolidating their royal power, a task which was immeasurably facilitated by the decimation of the nobility during the Wars of the Roses. By the first half of the sixteenth century the king of England, Henry VIII (1509-1547), was ready to hold the balance of power in the struggle between the Holy Roman Emperor (and king of Spain), Charles V of Habsburg (1519-1558), and the king of France, Francis I of Valois (1515-1547)—both at that time more formidable powers than the island kingdom. Commercial and colonial rivalries with Spain and the Dutch Netherlands preoccupied England during much of the second part of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries respectively. During the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), in which the Catholic kings of France were engaged in fighting the Catholic Habsburg rulers of Austria, the Empire, and of Spain, England preserved neutrality, partly because of internal troubles between king and parliament which culminated in the Puritan Revolution and the execution of Charles I (1625-1649).

The Thirty Years' War which was continued by Spain against France for another eleven years, namely, until the Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659), had left Spain so weakened that she ceased to be a serious competitor of England in the colonial, commercial, and maritime field. England had also overcome the commercial and colonial rivalry of the Dutch Netherlands. The elimination of these two of her rivals—Spain and the Dutch Netherlands—left only two contestants in the field. One of these, France, had emerged from the Thirty Years' War as the predominant power of Europe, replacing Spain which had held this position during the preceding century and a half. The restored Stuarts—Charles II (1660-1685) and his brother James II (1685-1688)—pursued

¹ F.E., by the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438).

a vacillating policy in regard to France, at times allying themselves with the enemies of France and at other times maintaining neutrality as pensioners of their cousin Louis XIV who knew how to buy them off. It was only when William III, the stadholder of the Dutch Netherlands (1672-1702), in 1689 ascended the throne of England—as joint ruler with his wife Mary, the last Stuart's elder daughter—that a determined and consistent foreign policy in relation to France was inaugurated. The homeland of William III had had to bear the brunt of the attacks of Louis XIV in his repeated drives to achieve the “natural boundaries” for France, and as a result of the latter's persistent aggression the Orange ruler became an implacable foe of the Grand Monarch.

II. The Second Hundred Years' War (1689-1815)

1. From the League of Augsburg to Utrecht (1689-1713) : The First Phase

The opportunity that was offered to William upon becoming king of England was not lost on him. He had already as ruler of his Netherlands participated in every alliance that had been formed against Louis XIV to check the later's expansionist aims. He would now add the strength of England to any future alliance and himself become the soul and spirit of resistance to the ever increasing ambitions of the French king. Immediately upon his accession to the English throne he joined the League of Augsburg, which had been recently (1686) formed against France, and took part in its war against Louis XIV to prevent him from seizing the Rhenish Palatinate.² In the protracted struggle the proud French king came nearer defeat than at any previous time of his long reign (1643-1715); he was not only checked in his drive for the Palatinate, but had finally even to yield some of his ill-gotten territorial gains, made on previous occasions.

The addition of England to the alliance of continental powers against France had thus borne fruit. And the War of the League of Augsburg whose beginning coincides with the accession of William III to the throne of England ushered in a period of almost continuous struggles between England and France which were to last for well over a hundred years (1689-1815) and which can fittingly be described as the Second Hundred Years' War

² It is known as the War of the League of Augsburg or the War of the Palatinate (1689-1697).

between these two countries. In its decisive stages it was destined to culminate in triumphs of England over France, and in its ultimate outcome it was to end wars between these two states apparently forever. It was also destined to assign to England³ the role of the "*balancer*" and thereby the "*arbiter*" in the contests between the great powers of the continent of Europe, a position which Britain held undisputedly until the First World War and for some years thereafter but which she definitely lost with the upsurge of Axis aggression and the resulting decline of her power.

The alliances which were formed against Louis XIV were aimed at the preservation of the balance of power on the continent of Europe which Louis threatened to upset by his aggression. England would—since the accession of William III—participate in every alliance to be concluded by continental powers against France which already possessed the political hegemony in Europe and which was regarded as the greatest threat to the balance of power. England hoped thereby to preserve that balance on the continent of Europe. Besides, as already stated previously, England and France were the two remaining rivals for the mastery of colonies and overseas commerce. Both had colonies and commercial interests in adjoining areas and were bound to clash over these issues. Both had trading posts in East India and both had colonies in the New World—in 1689 England had ten colonies on a lengthy, narrow strip along the Atlantic seaboard and France had the vast but sparsely populated expanses of "New France" (Canada and Louisiana).

By 1689 the chance ultimately to control East India and North America seemed to be about evenly divided between the two rivals. What finally decided the issue in favor of Britain was in India undoubtedly the diplomatic and military skill of Robert Clive, governor of the British East India Company. These proved superior to the duplicity of Dupleix, the French governor, who eventually found himself hopelessly outwitted by his British counterpart. In America most probably the fact that the British colonies possessed a relatively compact population of European stock which already by 1689 had reached about 300,000 as against only about 20,000 Frenchmen in "New France," was the deciding factor. By the middle of the 18th century—on the eve of the decisive struggle between the two states over colonial su-

³ Since the Act of Union with Scotland (1707) known as Great Britain.

premacy in the New World—there were already about 1,300,000 settlers in the thirteen British colonies, but only about 60,000 in the French colonies. From then (1689) on, every war in which England would be involved against France on the continent of Europe for the preservation of the balance of power would have its counterpart overseas (in America and India) for colonial and commercial predominance and mastery of the seas. Thus the War of the League of Augsburg had its parallel in the American colonies in King William's War.

For higher stakes Louis XIV gave up his attempts to attain the "natural boundaries" for France. He was anxious to terminate the war over the Palatinate—with loss, because he saw an opportunity to place a Bourbon—his grandson Philip—on the throne of Spain with the ultimate prospect of uniting Spain with France and their colonial empires under one Bourbon king. This opportunity offered itself when the Spanish line of the Habsburgs became extinct in 1700 and Philip was named heir to the crown of Spain and its dominions by the last Habsburg king, Charles II. The acceptance of the Spanish throne by Philip would mean war against a coalition of European powers and Louis XIV knew it. But he was determined to accept the challenge because the prize was too great to be given up without a battle. The Austrian line of the Habsburgs claimed the Spanish throne for Archduke Charles—his was a better claim than Philip's, and the Grand Alliance was formed to back Charles of Habsburg against Philip of Bourbon, in reality against Louis XIV. William III of England and Holland joined Austria, Prussia, and Savoy against France and Spain—William being the driving force to prevent the upsetting of the balance of power by the union of France and Spain. This was the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1713).

The allies gained a series of brilliant victories over the armies of Louis XIV, and the Grand Monarch's dream to see a Bourbon ruler on the Spanish throne would have been rudely shattered if not for two circumstances: *first*, the death of William III early in 1702, just after the beginning of the war, and *second*, Britain's readiness to compromise after about a decade of warfare. Had William III lived to the end of the war, it can safely be assumed that he would not have yielded to Louis' aspirations, considering the military situation as it was. It is true, the war was vigorously prosecuted during the reign of his successor Queen Anne (1702-1714)—its counterpart in the colonies is known as Queen Anne's War, and during that period the greatest battles were won in

which the British duke of Marlborough took a distinguished part. But a change of government in Britain coupled with the accession of the pretender Charles to the Austrian throne and to the—then already empty—title of Holy Roman Emperor in 1711 cooled off British enthusiasm for continuing the war. The balance of power in Europe would now be upset whether the Bourbons gained control over both France and Spain or whether the Habsburgs united the Austrian and Spanish possessions under their rule. The latter possibility appeared to Britain no less distasteful than the former.

However, Britain's leading statesman, Lord Bolingbroke, a great champion of the balance of power idea, had a compromise plan to divide the Spanish dominions among the two claimants, and Britain was ready to make peace on those terms. The British Government opened peace negotiations with Louis XIV behind the back of Britain's allies and when she was ready to withdraw from the war, her allies had no choice left but to concur. The war was terminated by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), one of the great peace settlements of modern times and second only in importance to the Peace of Westphalia (1648). By the terms of this treaty the grandson of Louis XIV was permitted to retain Spain and her colonies as Philip V, with the stipulation that never should the crowns of France and Spain be united under one ruler. However, to compensate the Austrian Habsburgs for yielding their claim to the Spanish throne, both the Spanish Netherlands and most of the Italian possessions of Spain were ceded to them.

This division of the Spanish possessions Lord Bolingbroke considered as necessary for the preservation of the balance of power in Europe and this purpose was expressed in the treaty: "*ad conservandum in Europa equilibrium.*" The Treaty of Utrecht constitutes a landmark in the history of international relations because it was the first time that the principle of the balance of power was avowedly applied and expressly incorporated in the body of the agreement. Needless to say that Britain looked also after her more immediate colonial interests by relieving France of Newfoundland, Acadia, which was renamed Nova Scotia, and the Hudson's Bay Territory—the first instalment on the French colonial empire which she coveted. She also secured the rock of Gibraltar and Minorca as well as trading privileges from Spain. While France suffered losses in the New World, her prestige in Europe was considerably enhanced as a result of her success in placing a Bourbon on the throne of Spain. This would increase

Bourbon influence in Europe because it was expected that just as the Spanish Habsburgs and the Austrian Habsburgs had always extended mutual aid to one another, the Bourbons of Spain would at all times be found on the side of the Bourbons of France.

2. From Utrecht (1713) to Paris (1763): A Decisive Phase

This natural alliance was cemented formally by the Family Compact of 1733 which bound the Bourbon rulers to mutual aid. In the following War of the Polish Election (1733-1738), in which Austria and Russia fought successfully against France and Spain to prevent the establishment of Bourbon control over Poland, Britain remained neutral. But a new phase in the Second Hundred Years' War between Britain and France opened when Frederick II of Prussia precipitated the War of the Austrian Succession (1740-1748), aiming at the dismemberment of the Habsburg Empire of Maria Theresa. France was allied with him and, to prevent the balance of power in Europe from being upset by the destruction of Austria, Britain joined Austria. Sir Robert Walpole on that occasion explained the attitude of his country in a classic statement on the importance of the balance of power. The Austrian dominions were preserved except for the province of Silesia, most of which was ceded to Prussia. In the colonies, hostilities were opened between Britain and Spain in 1739 in the War of Jenkin's Ear which finally merged with King George's War between Britain and the Bourbon kingdoms, as the counterpart to the European war is called. In the colonies the struggle was indecisive, since all conquests were mutually restored in the peace treaty (Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748).

Maria Theresa, not reconciled to the loss of Silesia, was bent upon revenge and with the aid of her foreign minister, Count Kaunitz, the greatest statesman of his age, she succeeded in winning Russia and finally even France, who had just recently supported Prussia and had been a traditional enemy of the Habsburgs for well over 200 years, as allies against Prussia. Maria Theresa was determined to retaliate in kind and, aided by her allies, to dismember Frederick's kingdom. She thought she could count on Britain, her ally in the previous war against Prussia. But Britain was concerned about maintaining the balance of power on the continent and had drawn closer to Prussia.⁴

⁴ Frederick II had promised to protect Hanover, of which the British kings were sovereigns, against encroachments by France.

Besides, the French and Indian War had commenced in the colonies in 1754, with Britain and France facing each other as enemies, and when the Seven Years' War broke out in Europe two years later, Britain found herself on the side of Prussia against France—her perennial enemy, Austria—her recent ally, and Russia. This complete turnabout of alliances by France and Britain is known as the "diplomatic revolution."

Britain's aid to Prussia consisted of generous money grants which made it possible for her to continue the war. But in spite of the brilliant military exploits of Frederick II which won him the title of "the Great," Prussia would have eventually been crushed by the overwhelming superiority of her powerful enemies. What finally saved Frederick II from ultimate defeat were not the subsidies from Britain, which in the later stages of the war had even ceased to arrive, but the death of the Tsarina Elizabeth (1762) and the abrupt withdrawal of Russia from the war. This turn of events made it impossible for the Allies to bring Prussia to her knees, and the entrance of Spain into the war at this late stage (1762) could no more change the outcome. Maria Theresa was now (Treaty of Hubertusburg, 1763) finally resigned to the permanent loss of Silesia, and Prussia emerged from this war as a great power and as the peer of Austria in the Empire.

But greater than the results in Europe were those in the colonies. By the Treaty of Paris (1763), which ended the war between Britain and the Bourbon kingdoms of France and Spain, the British victories in America and India found their culmination in the loss by France of practically her whole colonial empire. The whole St. Lawrence Valley and all French territory east of the Mississippi River were ceded to Britain, and the vast wilderness west of the Mississippi, known as Western Louisiana, was transferred to Spain to compensate her for the loss of Florida to Britain. In India the road was open for Britain to extend political control over the great sub-continent. France was permitted to keep her five trading posts—which she still holds today—but she returned there as trader only, with her ambitions for political domination over India thwarted forever.

A great phase in the Second Hundred Years' War between Britain and France had come to an end. And this phase proved vastly more decisive than that which had terminated with the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). The struggle for colonial and commercial predominance and for the mastery of the seas between

the two remaining contestants which had begun in earnest in 1689 was now decided by the victory of Britain over France. Britain, not France, emerged by 1763 as the leading colonial and commercial power in the world and the mistress of the seas. Since then it could truthfully be said: "Britannia rules the waves."

3. The American Revolution (1776-1783): An Important Interlude

However decisive the outcome was, the conflict between the two rivals was by no means over. It was to go on relentlessly. France was not reconciled to the loss of her proud colonial empire. She only looked for an opportunity to recover it. And that opportunity offered itself when the Thirteen Colonies in the New World revolted against Britain. France, however, did not immediately make common cause with the rebels. Before taking such a step, she wanted first to see whether the colonies would manage to hold their own against the mother country. When the colonists won the battle of Saratoga (October, 1777), France was ready to risk war with Britain by extending *de jure* recognition to the United States of America, the first independent state in the New World, born in revolution and still struggling against heavy odds to achieve freedom from Britain. France also concluded a military alliance with the new confederation. As was to be expected, Britain regarded the French action as intervention in her domestic affairs—and rightfully so—and declared war on France (1778). But to the struggling colonies French aid proved invaluable for the achievement of their aims, and Britain was kept occupied by France and Spain (which had entered the war in 1779) in her far-flung possessions to such an extent that she not only missed the opportunity of subduing the rebels, but even experienced the humiliation of the surrender of her army at Yorktown (1781). In the Treaty of Paris (1783) Britain finally bowed to the inevitable: She recognized the independence of the new republic which was destined to come to her aid twice in one generation during the 20th century.

What did France gain for herself from participation in this War of American Independence? She had hoped that she would recover her colonial empire which she had lost to Britain only fifteen years earlier. She herself received only Tobago and Senegal from Britain, although Spain regained Minorca and Florida which she had ceded to Britain in 1763 (Treaty of Versailles,

1783). True, France had the satisfaction that Britain lost the probably most important part of her colonial empire—although the actual importance of this loss might not have been realized at that time. On the other hand, Canada which had been only recently (1763) acquired by Britain had remained loyal to her throughout the American Revolution mainly due to the tactful British policy in dealing with Canada's Catholic population by granting the French Canadians complete religious equality (Quebec Act, 1774).⁵

The British government showed here a wisdom in which it was utterly deficient when dealing with the thirteen colonies. France could also find comfort in the idea that it was largely her aid which contributed to the loss of these colonies by Britain and that, as far as this result was concerned, her intervention was successful. Yet, as far as she herself was concerned, this was merely a negative success, because she did not get her colonies back, but by this costly venture only precipitated her bankruptcy and consequently the great revolution which was to come after short six years (1789), overthrow the political and social order in France, and plunge Europe into wars which were to last for almost a quarter of a century. Another century passed before France again became a great colonial power—second only to Britain—but this time the bulk of her overseas empire was located in the newly partitioned continent of Africa, with considerable possessions in the Far East, but only a few scattered islands and French Guiana in the western Hemisphere.

4. The Struggle against Revolutionary and Napoleonic France (1793-1815): A Climax

British public opinion soon became distrustful of, and with the increasing excesses of the revolutionaries openly hostile to, the aims of the French Revolution, and was greatly influenced in its attitude by the forebodings and warnings of Edmund Burke, especially when they were borne out by the fast-moving events. Yet, Britain did not join the First Coalition against revolutionary France which was formed by Austria and Prussia in 1792 and which aimed at crushing the forces of the revolution and restoring the monarchy to its absolute position. Nor did the suspension of the king, the overthrow of the monarchy, and the establishment of a republic (September 22, 1792) bring Britain

⁵ Which she denied to the Catholics in Great Britain until the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829.

into the war. But the execution of Louis XVI (January 21, 1793) shocked British conscience, which forgot that English rebels once (1649) had done the same to one of their own kings (Charles I Stuart). Besides, the Austrian (Belgian) Netherlands just across the channel had been invaded by French troops. Now (1793) Britain entered the First Coalition against the Republic and considered the campaign partly as a punitive expedition against the assassins of the monarch and partly as a protest against the conquest of Belgium. The execution of the king had made Britain keenly aware of the serious danger to all European monarchies and to orderly government everywhere, emanating from the revolutionary government of France and from the principles of the French Revolution. While Britain had been slow to come into the war against France, once she joined the fight, she remained in it to the bitter end,⁶ never faltering, never giving up, at various times standing alone, but always undaunted in spirit, until she saw her enemy defeated at last and an enduring peace established. The Second Hundred Years' War between Britain and France reached here its climactic, its decisive, but also its final phase. Never again were the two neighbors across the channel to engage in war against each other. But before that stage was reached, both had to suffer great losses and to endure untold hardships for a period of two decades.

Never before in her history since the Norman Conquest (1066) or since the time of the Great Armada (1588) had Britain been in such grave danger as in the era of Napoleon. But never before had Britain shown such determination, perseverance, and resistance as in that period. She not only kept up the spirit of resistance herself, but also aroused that spirit in other states and enkindled it again when it threatened to break down under the blows of successive defeats at the hands of France and especially Napoleon Bonaparte who became her outstanding military leader in 1796 and her virtual master in 1799. Britain organized successive coalitions against France, the second in 1798 and the third in 1805. She felt that as long as the continental powers, such as Austria, Prussia, and Russia, kept the French armies occupied on the continent, she would remain safe from invasion. She aided mainly with liberal subsidies to enable the continental powers to keep fairly large armies in the field. It might be averred that her motives were selfish. But on the other hand,

⁶ With the exception of one brief interval of 14 months—the “peace” concluded at Amiens which lasted only from March, 1802 to May, 1803.

if the other states which joined her in those coalitions would have shown the same determination and perseverance in opposing France as Britain did, victory against France might have been achieved at a rather early stage of the fighting, thereby saving innumerable lives of both allied and French soldiers and sparing untold suffering of the populations of all states concerned.

It was only because the powers which opposed France (and especially Napoleon after he had emerged as the leader) did not all unite from the beginning and did not all—like Britain—remain in the fight against France that Napoleon was able to bring the greater part of Europe under his control and threatened to become master of the world. He proceeded under the time-honored principle of “divide and conquer” which had already been applied by ancient Rome with such signal success and had helped her to become mistress of the then known civilized world largely by default of her opponents who failed to unite against her. The functioning of the balance of power has never failed to check or even to destroy the aggressor who may be stronger than any one of his opponents but who is not equal to *all* his opponents when united against him. Napoleon was not the first nor was he the last aggressor who benefited from the fact that his potential opponents did not all unite against him until it was almost too late. Prussia withdrew from the First Coalition (1795) and left Austria to her own resources and defeat. Prussia did not join the Second Coalition, and Russia left this coalition, while Austria continued to fight and again met with defeat. Prussia did not join the Third Coalition until after Austria had been forced by disastrous military defeat (Battle of Austerlitz) to drop out—only to suffer terrible defeat herself.

But Britain never withdraw from any coalition. She herself made great contributions to the weakening and ultimate defeat of Napoleon. In the Battle of the Nile (August 1, 1798) Admiral Nelson with his squadron destroyed the French fleet which had brought Bonaparte’s expeditionary force to Egypt with the aim of cutting off India from access by Britain. Nelson thereby deprived the French troops in Egypt of all possibilities of retreat. Bonaparte himself escaped from Egypt (1799), leaving his army to its fate. In the spring of 1805 Napoleon was completing serious preparations for the invasion of Britain. He had at his disposal both the French and Spanish fleets, since he had brought

Spain into an alliance. To stave off an attack upon his homeland and to occupy Napoleon on the continent, William Pitt, the Younger, Britain's perennial Prime Minister during most of the crucial period of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, succeeded in organizing the Third Coalition against France with Austria and Russia as allies.⁷ As anticipated by Pitt, Napoleon immediately dropped all plans of invasion⁸ and turned with full force against his continental enemies.

On October 21, 1805 the British fleet under Lord Nelson met the combined French and Spanish fleets off Trafalgar and destroyed them. Though Napoleon was winning his war on the continent in a more triumphant manner than ever before at Ulm (October 20) and Austerlitz (December 2), the destruction of the allied fleets deprived him of any prospects of ever invading and defeating Britain in open warfare and assured British control over the high seas until the end of the struggle. Hence, the opinion is wide-spread among competent authorities that Napoleon's Empire was doomed by the defeat at Trafalgar rather than by later disasters which befell his armies, such as the Russian campaign (1812) or the battle near Leipzig (1813). For, as long as Britain remained unconquered and mistress of the seas and Napoleon had no means of subduing her, he would never be able to control Europe permanently nor could he ever fulfill his dreams of world conquest. Britain would remain a beacon of hope to the conquered peoples of the continent and would use every opportunity to encourage uprisings against the French. Britain especially deserves great credit for upholding the spirit of resistance among the Spaniards who proved the most troublesome of the conquered nations and who at no time could be considered as subdued. A British Expeditionary Force under Sir Arthur Wellesley, later duke of Wellington, landed in Portugal in 1808 and fought its way through Spain, maintaining a foothold on the Iberian Peninsula throughout most of the time between 1808 and 1813, the period of the Peninsular war, aiding the Spanish guerrillas who were harassing the French troops.

Napoleon resorted to indirect methods in an attempt to bring the "nation of shopkeepers," as he used to call Britain, to her knees. By his Continental System he ordered a tight blockade against Britain and exacted pledges of fullest cooperation from

⁷ Pitt died broken-hearted the following year, only 47 years of age.

⁸ How serious they were, is still a matter of dispute.

the states of the continent which were either at his mercy or, like Russia after Tilsit (1807), allied with him. But soon these states realized that they had promised more than they could afford to keep if they wanted to avoid economic suicide. Although there were also other causes that led to friction between Napoleon I and Tsar Alexander I of Russia,⁹ the most important and decisive factor was the withdrawal of Russia from cooperation with the Continental System. Britain thus became indirectly the cause of Napoleon's attack upon Russia (June 24, 1812.) The disastrous retreat from Moscow and back into Germany precipitated the War of Liberation, brought first Prussia and finally Austria into the alliance—an event which turned the balance of power in favor of the allies. In the Battle of the Nations near Leipzig (October 16-19, 1813) Napoleon's newly raised army was decisively beaten, and as a result all territory east of France proper freed from the invader. The allied armies converging upon Paris early in 1814 from five different directions—Wellington's force coming up from Spain through southern France—took the capital city on March 31, 1814 and left the self-made emperor no other recourse but to sign his abdication. When after his return from Elba in 1815 he tried for another Hundred Days, it was Britain's Wellington who deserved the main credit for administering the *coup de grace* to the Corsican adventurer at Waterloo (June 18, 1815). It was on a British island in the south Atlantic (St. Helena) that the former conqueror remained confined for the last years of his life (1815-1821).

At various periods—from 1801 to 1802, from 1803 to 1805, and, except for continued Spanish guerrilla warfare and Austria's premature uprising (1809), again from 1807 to 1812—Britain stood alone in the fight against the most powerful conqueror the modern world had seen up to that time. During those trying years she had to bear the brunt of the Corsican's wrath. But she also had the satisfaction of seeing how this Continental System, which undoubtedly left its mark on her, failed in the end in its main purpose to starve her into submission and how finally all victims of Napoleonic aggression rallied to the common cause and won. The Second Hundred Years' War was over. The Congress of Vienna had settled the peace (1815) and Britain's representative Castlereagh had taken a prominent part in this

⁹ Such as Napoleon's intervention in Sweden, the establishment of the Grand-Duchy of Warsaw, and Napoleon's marriage to Maria Louisa of Austria.

settlement. France received generous treatment at the hands of the allies, mainly due to Talleyrand's unmatched diplomacy. She was treated almost as an equal partner of the alliance rather than as the defeated power which should be punished for her aggression. Napoleon was the scoundrel and the Bourbons were innocent—this Talleyrand had driven home to the victorious allies and this sounded convincing.

Standing before the gates of Paris, the four great powers—Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia—concluded a formal twenty-year alliance against recurrent French aggression—the famous Quadruple Alliance, born in the Treaty of Chaumont (March 1, 1814). But only three years after the Congress of Vienna, France was admitted at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818) as a full-fledged member to this alliance of her erstwhile enemies, thus making it the Quintuple Alliance, and thereby became a member of the Concert of Europe which tried to preserve the balance of power in Europe. The enmity was forgotten, and the fear of French aggression had ceased. To be sure, the peacemakers of Vienna had seen to it that France's neighbors were strengthened and that she was now surrounded by more powerful states which would make them a bulwark against any future attack by France. On her north-eastern border, Prussia was enlarged by territory in western Germany; to the north, the Dutch Netherlands received the former Austrian Netherlands; and in the south-east Sardinia was given Genoa and Austria attained a dominant position in Italy by the acquisition of Lombardy and Venetia. Britain strengthened her colonial empire by the addition of former Dutch colonies such as Cape Colony, Ceylon, and part of Guiana, which she had seized during the war and in the possession of which she was confirmed in the peace settlement.

(To be concluded in the March issue)

AQUINAS: MEDIAEVAL HISTORIAN

R. IGNATIUS BURNS
ALMA COLLEGE

I

Unlike the founding-fathers of modern philosophy Descartes and Kant, Thomas Aquinas had a profound reverence for the past. He expressed contempt for those who think "wisdom was born with themselves," and he was convinced that one must "carefully, frequently and reverently apply his mind to the teachings of the past [*documentis maiorum*], neither neglecting them through laziness nor contemning them through pride."¹ Each earlier writer, he felt, had discovered—or at least could stimulate the discovery of—some aspect of the truth, and their successors were thus in a position to synthesize these findings. Knowledge is a common work and must proceed generation by generation. He lays down the principle that

If every one of the earlier thinkers has found an element of truth, then these elements taken together and unified are to the later investigators a powerful help toward a comprehensive knowledge of truth.²

A complementary principle is expressed in the *Summa theologica*:

It seems natural to human reason to advance gradually from the imperfect to the perfect. Hence, in speculative sciences, we see that the teaching of the earlier philoso-

¹ "Soli sunt homines, et cum eis oritur sapientia," *De aeternitate mundi contra murmurantes*, Vives edn. vol. XXVII, *opusculum* XXIII, p. 453; this is one of the rare occasions when Thomas indulges in irony. The second quotation is from *S. th.*, II-IIae, q. 49, a. 3, *ad 2*: "homo sollicite, frequenter et reverenter applicat animum suum documentis maiorum, non neglegens ea propter ignoriam nec contemnens propert superbiam." In the same article he tells us that "in matters of prudence man stands in very great need of being taught by others, especially by old folk who have acquired a sane understanding of the ends in practical matters." It is worth noting that Kant "n'avait fort probablement jamais ouvert la *Somme de saint Thomas*; il ne fait aucune allusion à aucun des docteurs catholiques . . . Kant ignore non seulement toute la tradition catholique mais—le mot n'est pas trop fort—toute l'histoire de la pensée humaine. Kuno Fischer (après Hamann, Rink, Nicolai et de'autres) admet lui-même que cette ignorance chez Kant a été complète." (P. Charles, "Kant et Kantisme," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, VIII: col. 2305). Descartes was not so extreme, but his system is thoroughly aprioristic.

² "Dum unusquisque praecedentium aliquid de veritate invenit, simul in unum collectum, posteriores introducit ad magnam veritatis cognitionem" (*In XII libros metaphysicorum*, lib. II, lec. 1; Vives XXIV: 405).

phers was imperfect, and that it was afterwards perfected by those who succeeded them.³

Thus he begins his treatise *De substantiis separatis* with "those things about which human conjecture originally conceived" on the subject; and the larger part of the treatise is taken up with these various opinions.⁴ "We must give ear to the opinions of the ancients," he admonishes us in his *De anima*,

no matter who it is who made the statements. There is a twofold benefit in this. We thereby acquire for our own use whatever was correctly said by them; and we avoid that in which they erred.⁵

His imposing reverence for men like Aristotle and Augustine (though he differs at times with both, and his deference to any number of lesser minds like Boethius, is a lesson in intellectual humility when investigating the past. In his *Contra errores Graecorum* he offers several reasons why

we must not contemn or reject passages in which the ancient doctors express themselves less carefully than the moderns; nor should we interpret them too rigorously, but rather with reverence.⁶

Even the errors (which may possess efficacy by reason of the truth embedded in them) help us indirectly by alerting us, offering us matter for criticism; as a result "veritas limpidius appareret" and we are afforded a "quoddam exercitium" in the pursuit of truth. Besides, to combat erroneous conclusions one must first understand and properly explain them; for this reason Thomas envied the Fathers their advantage of living with the heretics and so studying their errors at first hand. In one amiable passage he goes so far as to proffer his gratitude to those who have "superficialiter" arrived at false conclusions and have thus en-

³ *S. th.*, I-IIae, q. 97, a. 1 *In II librum sententiarum, dist. III, q. 1, a. 2* (Vives VIII: 48) offers the basic reason for this: "Ratiocinatur homo discurendo et inquirendo lumine intellectuali per continuum et tempus obumbrato . . ."

⁴ Intro.; Vives XXVII: 273.

⁵ "Intendentes ad praesens necesse est accipere opiniones antiquorum, quiunque sint . . ." (*In libros de anima expositio, lib. I, lec. 2*; Vives XXIV: 10).

⁶ ". . . non sunt contempnenda aut abjicienda; sed nec etiam ea extendere oportet, sed exponere reverenter" (*prooemium*; Vives XXIX: 344). Also in the *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia Dei*, q. 3, 18: "Seeing that this opinion was held by such great doctors as Basil, Gregory Nazianzen and others, we must not contemn it as being erroneous" (but cf. *infra*, n. 36).

couraged profounder study by others!⁷

The *doctor angelicus* had a twofold reason for searching the records of the past with particular care: his profession both as philosopher and as theologian. He championed the mutual independence of these sciences—the one as based on reason, the other on truths revealed—and he recognized how important a study of the past was to each. As Gilson remarked in the opening sentence of his preface to *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*:

it is not impossible to become a competent scientist without knowing much about the history of science, but no man can carry far his own philosophical reflections until he first studies the history of philosophy.⁸

The need is even more apparent in theology, where revelation has been transmitted through the centuries or where the universal custom of the church at a given point in history may be used in proving a thesis. Both Augustine and Cano have pointed out at some length the theologian's need of some familiarity even with secular history.⁹ From his authorities the philosopher might glean truths, avoid past errors, or be stimulated to further study. The argument from another's authority was of course "the weakest" (*infirmissimus*), for its validity was sharply limited by the worth of the reasons advanced; but in theology a human authority might be shown to be equivalently the voice of God or a witness to church doctrine, and here the argument from

⁷ In *XII libros metaphysicorum*, loc. cit.; *Summa contra gentiles*, lib. I, cap. 2. He closes the *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas* by noting that he battled their errors "non per documenta fidei, sed per ipsorum Philosophorum rationes et dicta," then giving his famed challenge that the fight be continued along these lines and "not on street corners, nor before children who cannot rightly judge these complex cases."

⁸ New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937; p. vii.

⁹ Melchior Cano, *De locis theologicis* devotes a long book (XI) to the subject, in chapter 2 of which he says: "rudes omnino theologos illos esse, in quorum lucubrationibus historia muta est. Mihi quidem non theologi solum sed nulli satis eruditi vindentur, quibus res olim gestae ignotae sunt. . . Historia quippe, ut Cicero verissime dixit, cum magistra vitae est, tum lux etiam veritatis." The Augustine reference is to his *De doctrina Christiana*, lib. II, cap. 28. He remarks that "whatever that science called history teaches us about the order of past events is a very important help to us. Through it we are aided in understanding the Sacred Books, even though we learn it outside the Church through our study as children. . ." (Tr. of J. J. Gavigan O. S. A., *Christian Instruction*, Fathers of the Church series, L. Schopp et alii eds., New York: 1947; pp. 98-100). Augustine then expands this principle in examples.

authority was *efficasissimus*.¹⁰ Thomas insists on the need of knowing the Fathers since often the Holy Spirit teaches us through them.¹¹ Though any individual Father is quite capable of error, still he was closer to apostolic times than we and therefore had better opportunity to discern the sense of a doctrine of faith. Moreover, the historical practice of the church could be (by reason of Christ's promise of guidance) a surer source of doctrine "than Augustine or Jerome or any other doctor";¹² sometimes too a doctor's statement must be interpreted by a known historical custom, or by the historical context of his times.

All the Thomistic principles thus far noticed constitute a definite attitude toward the historical past. They help to explain why over half of his works are, in a certain broad sense, historical: commentaries on men like Boethius, Aristotle (thirteen works), Peter Lombard, and Scripture. As readers of Aquinas are well aware, there was nothing superficial in this grasp of ancient and mediaeval mentalities, Greek and Roman and Arab and Jew. His *Catena aurea* alone, though much of it is drawn from glosses, betrays a patristic background which amazes modern scholars; twenty-three Latin and fifty-seven Greek Fathers are marshalled in order, handled with familiarity, and quoted concisely and to the point. Opening his other works at random

¹⁰ *S. th., Ia, q. 1, a. 8, obj. 2* and reply. An example of his clear distinction between philosophy and theology is article 3 of question II, *In librum Boetii de trinitate expositio*.

¹¹ "Et ideo de aliquibus occultis revelandis aliquando tangitur mens [doctorum] a spiritu sancto, et aliquando non . . . Aliquando etiam aliqua dicunt a se ipsis"; his general conclusion is "expositiones Sanctorum [doctorum] sunt a Spiritu sancto" (*Quaestiones quodlibetales, quodl. XII, a. 26*). In the *Inlibrum beati Dionysii de divinis nominibus, cap. II, lec. 1*, he urges the conservation not just of scripture "sed et ea quae dicta sunt a sacris doctoribus, qui sacram Scripturam illibatam conservaverunt" (Vives XXIX: 40).

¹² In rejecting the opinion that children of Jews might be baptized against their parents' will, Thomas takes occasion to lay down the principle "quod maximam habet auctoritatem Ecclesiae consuetudo, que semper est in omnibus aemulanda; quia et ipsa doctrina catholicorum doctorum ab Ecclesia auctoritatem habet. Unde magis standum est auctoritati Ecclesiae quam auctoritati vel Augustini, vel Hieronymi, vel cuiuscumque doctoris." (*S. th., II-II ae, q. X, a. 12*). In the *In IV librum sententiarum* he interprets Gregory by the practice of the church (*dist. VI, q. 1, 3, sol. 3, ad 3*; Vives X: 149). The *Quaestiones quodlibetales* have an article (*quodl. 11, a. 7*) stressing the importance of custom in abrogating law, in specifying it etc.

one is likely to meet a large number of authors casually worked into the text. In one article, for instance, we see Damascene, Basil, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Aristotle, Dionysius, Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Origen, Strabo, Averroes, and the Scriptures; in another we have Aristotle, Homer, Plato, Augustine, Boethius, Damascene, and Ptolemy.¹³

Some years ago an industrious soul, whose name unfortunately has been lost to posterity, began to page his way through the *Summa theologica*, emerging with the following vital statistics. The *Summa* contains thirty-eight treatises, 631 questions, 3000 articles, and well over 10,000 objections. Now, that our saint formulated ten thousand objections to his system in this work alone is not in itself a tribute to him as an historian. For our purpose the real significance of all these objections is that in them we may read a comprehensive history of ideas in philosophy and theology. From the earliest Greeks up to and including his contemporaries, "not a single philosophical current of any importance remained unknown to him."¹⁴ Surely this talent in the history of ideas, even after its defects and inaccuracies have been conceded, deserves recognition.

The same indefatigable source who reduce the *Summa* to 631 questions, 3000 articles, and 10,000 objections, has still more to add on the results of his mathematical excursions into this single work: forty-one popes and nineteen councils, forty-five fathers and six encyclopedic opera, forty-six philosophers, orators, poets, and historians are cited—very many, of course, more than once.

Cajetan, and after him Leo XIII in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, rightly paid tribute to this monumental documentation, noting that Thomas had "inherited" the doctors of antiquity by

¹³ Respectively *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia Dei*, q. 3, a. 18, and the *Contra gentiles*, lib. III, pt. 2, cap. 84. Ancient authors cited in the *Summa theologica* include also Sallust, Terence, Hippocrates, Galen, Euclid, Cato, Varro, Virgil, Caesar, Horace, Cicero, Ovid, Strabo, Livy, Seneca, and Valerius Maximus; interesting statistics along these lines may be culled from such indices as that comprising volume XXII in the Dominican translation of the *Summa theologica*.

¹⁴ R. Welschen O. P., "De continuitate et autonimia scientifica philosophiae Thomisticae," *Xenia Thomistica* (S. Szabo O. P., ed., 3 vols., Rome: 1925), I :131. On Thomas' method of "footnoting" C. Spicq O. P. concludes: "Il donne toujuors les références d'origine aux auteurs et aux livres, et cette dernière precision est une innovation qui doit etre relevée, car elle marque un grand progrès. . ." (*Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen age*, Paris: Bibliothèque Thomiste series XXVI, 1944; p. 307 and cf. note 4).

reason of his reverence for them, and adding that he had gathered together their teachings ("dispersed like the scattered limbs of a body") to form them into a unique whole.

II

Having established the fact of Thomas' documentation, we turn naturally to its mode. We know that he used history; but how did he use it? Was he aware of the value of original sources, critical in accepting them, competent in interpretation—or was he content simply to borrow and to pass on the excerpts then available in glosses? Before examining his critical theory and practice in matters historical, however, three points should be insisted upon. The first is the mediaeval device which allowed recognized "authorities" to be quoted out of context. This convention was not unlike our modern use of suggestive fragments from Shakespeare or Browning, and added the color of authority, the flavor of tradition, to a thesis whose real proof both author and reader sought elsewhere. Though strange to our eye, this practice was a mediaeval commonplace; virtuosity in its use implied neither fraud nor lack of familiarity with the authority's original intent. Thus a pagan rhetorician or metaphysician might be "baptized," as it were, adapted and twisted to speak a Christian sentiment. At times men like Augustine would be subjected to a species of face-saving (even face-lifting, if you will) lest there be an implied rebuke over his having failed to reach the same conclusion as his interpreter. "This attempt to maintain the *auctoritas* of the revered figure of the past even when twisting his words into an opposite meaning, is a sure index of the admiration in which he was held. Rather than contradict or condemn an *auctor*, the writer was content to interpret."¹⁵ Von

¹⁵ E. A. Quain S. J., "The Medieval Accesus ad Auctores," *Traditio*, III (1945), p. 225, and cf. *passim* 223-26. Thus in our author we find the pagan "unjust possessors" of truth are to be despoiled: "ab injustis possessoribus in usum nostrum vindicanda sunt" (*S. th.*, Ia, q. 84, a. 5). Again in the *De trinitate*, *supra cit.*; the *In epistolam ad Corinthios I*, cap. I, lec. 3 (he is discussing the use of secular knowledge); the *In Epistolam ad Titum*, cap. I, lec. 3 *ad finem*. An interesting example of "exponere reverenter" is found in q. 97 of the *Responsio de articulis CVII sumptis ex opere Petri de Tarantasia* (Vives XXVII: 216). Thomas quotes Paul (II Cor., X: 5) and Acts (XVII: 28): "Bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ," and "As some also of your own poets have said. . ." (*S. th.*, Ia, q. 1, a. 8, *ad 2*).

Hertling has analyzed some 250 of Thomas' Augustinian citations (200 are from the *Summa*) and noted those which accept Augustine's doctrines and those which simply transform them ("exponere reverenter" Thomas would say) into Aquinate ideas. Like other mediaeval authors he also felt free to quote from memory, to paraphrase or shorten or combine texts.¹⁶

But this served as corollary to a more basic methodological principle of the *doctor communis*, and herein lies our second prenote. Because he is not a pure historian (even of philosophy) but a philosopher and theologian *making use* of history, he acted not as an historian who probes human experience and records it but rather as a thinker who exploits that experience. "The study of philosophy," he wrote, "does not aim merely to find out what others have thought, but what the truth of the matter is."¹⁷ He was not a gleaner of texts nor a constructor of paraphrase primarily, but a commentator who corrected and absorbed his sources. This was no synthesis in the common understanding of that abused term, not an encyclopaedic compilation cleverly adapted—though he also employed the latter genre in his patristic manual for preachers and students, the *Catena aurea*. The synthesis was at a far deeper level. Thus Pegis can speak of the "metaphysical revolution" by which Aquinas "using the language of Aristotle" creates a novel Christian philosophy. And Maritain draws a charming picture of the Sicilian ox quietly eating up the eagle of Hippo, refashioning him to be flesh of his flesh. It is as though the monuments of antiquity—the pyramids, the colosseum, the early Romanesque chapels—had been plundered and from their disparate stones and tilings an architectonically novel structure, a Gothic cathedral, had been achieved.

Our last prenote (necessary for those who recognize his giant stature) is a warning against aquinolatry: Thomas was a man of his time. His intellectual genius was sharply delimited in space and in time, closely hobbled by the limitations of his predecessors and contemporaries, of the sources and reference tools

¹⁶ For example: "In assumendis autem Sanctorum testimoniis, plerumque opportuit aliqua rescindi de media ad prolixitatem vitandam, nec non ad manifestiorem sensum, vel secundum congruentiam expositionis, litterae ordinem commutari; interdum etiam sensum posui, verba dimisi. . ." (*Catena aurea in Matthaeum, epistola dedicatoria ad Urbanum IV*).

¹⁷ *In primos libros de coelo et mundo expositia, lib. I, lec. 22* (vives XXIII: 77): "non est ad hoc quod sciatur quid homines senserint, sed qualiter se habeat veritas rerum."

at his disposal, of the prejudicing circumstance and level of critical acumen which constituted his intellectual environment. He did not know Plato as profoundly as he knew Aristotle, nor Jerome as he knew Augustine. And while authors like Maimonides, Boethius, Avicenna, and Averroes were the subject of his devoted study, he obviously would not have had the opportunity or time to drink deeply from a large number of others quoted by him. We must concede that Thomas' historical sense itself was weak in comparison with that of present-day theologians; but this does not negate the fact that it yet was, as Grabmann remarks, "considerable."¹⁸ We should expect, then, the paradox of genius which does violence to its intellectual environment, yet remains to some degree its slave.

III

Thomas Aquinas was born into an age of manuscript discovery, collection, and translation. He shared the academic enthusiasms of his contemporaries and, in the matter of criticism as we shall see, he often surpassed them. Lecturing at or visiting the many Dominican institutions, he took special delight in their documents and libraries. William of Tocco remembers him as "discurrens per diversa monasteria, et diversorum Sanctorum legens volumina," stocking his memory with their contents.¹⁹ He had special access to the papal collections during his residence at the papal court (Anagni, Orvieto, Rome, Viterbo: 1259-1268). In Paris

¹⁸ *Thomas Aquinas, His Personality and Thought* (tr. V. Michel O.S.B.; New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 928, p. 44. An example of Thomas' historical deficiency is given by Ferdinand Cavallera in "Le Décret du concile de Trente sur la pénitence et l'extreme-onction," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, XXXIII (1932) 90n. cf. the surprising attitude in Thomas' *De forma absolutionis, cap. V in initio* (Vives XXVII: 423: "sed quomodo de omnibus potest testimonium perhibere, qui omnes non vidit?"

¹⁹ Guilielmus de Thoco O.P., *Vita*, in *Acta Sanctorum, Martii* (Paris 1865), I: 663; and on p. 670, "perlegens in diversorum monasteriorum librī." It is not easy to reconstruct the contents of such libraries, but a helpful idea of their contents may be gained from the study of one of them by F. Pelster S.J., "Die Bibliothek von Santa Caterina zu Pisa, eine Büchersammlung aus den Zeiten des Hl. Thomas von Aquin," *Xenia Thomistica, op. cit.*, III: 249-80. Once, asked by Father d'Afusta to confide the greatest grace he had received, Thomas replied: "I think that of having understood whatever I have read." Tocco tells us (p. 670) he was "modo mirabili memoria retentivus . . . ut hoc quod legendo semel caperet, perpetuo retineret"; and that (p. 663) in his wanderings among the libraries "pro majori parte ipsorum auctoritates mente retinuit, quas in exponendo notavit."

the splendid and rapidly expanding body of royal manuscripts was at his service, as were the royal libraries at Palermo. Among his acquaintances he could count such industrious documenters as Vincent of Beauvais and Raymond of Peñafort; the latter was then compiling the decretals, and it was due to his intercession that Thomas composed his *Summa contra gentiles*. A valuable aid in these historical searches was a memory, as St. Antonius put it, "like a huge library"—one which was noteworthy in an age of remarkable memories.

We know he valued and used original sources; but we also know that he was often content to dip into such anthologies as Strabo's *Glossa ordinaria*, Anselm of Laon's *Glossa interlinearis*, Lombard's *Libri sententiarum*, and Gratian's *Decretum*. It is very difficult to determine the precise extent of his documentation from originals. But de Ghellinck assures us that Thomas was one of the very few mediaeval theologians who went beyond these glosses. In noting that the "immensely erudite" Albertus Magnus always cited the Fathers from a gloss (Augustine perhaps excepted) even when employing the phrase "in originali," Vosté concludes: "in this matter the Angelic Doctor excels all his contemporaries by his accurate personal erudition and critical powers."²⁰ As an aside, we may add that the sure and pertinent use of glosses demanded no little virtuosity, and that Thomas might sometimes wring as much from a gloss as his modern successor can from the complete original. Thomas distinguishes between gloss and original in his dedicatory preface to the *Catena aurea* on Matthew, offering us a key to their respective use in that work.²¹

²⁰ I. M. Vosté O.P., "De investigandibus fontibus patristicis Sancti Thomae," *Angelicum*, XIV (1937), 420. The reference to de Ghellinck is from Vosté p. 429n.: "On voit la grande majorité des auteurs, S. Thomas excepte et quelques autres, se contenter habituellement . . ." Walafrid Strabo's gloss may conveniently be seen in Migne, *Patrologia latina*, CXII-CXIV, the sentences of Lombard in CXCI-CXCII, the *Decretum* in CXXXVII. Some scholars have concluded from internal evidence that Thomas had the original *acta* of at least several of the councils even though these would also have been available in collections like the *Decretum*.

²¹ "Pauca quidem certorum Auctorum verbis, ut plurimum ex Glossis adjiciens, quae, ut ab eorum dictis possent discerni, sub Glossae titulo praenotavi. Sed et in sanctorum Doctorum dictis hoc adhibui studium, ut singulorum Auctorum nomina . . . describantur." See, too, the distinction as made in the *In lib. I sententiarum, prologus, art. V.*

He had as well a lively appreciation of the difference between a good and a bad manuscript. From time to time he adverts to the dangers of corrupt texts.²² The little drama Tocco records from his life, in which he assured his fellow-travellers he would rather have Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew than be lord of Paris, refers to a purer text or a better translation.²³ His various documents in translation (by Erigena, Grosseteste, Sarrazin and others) he sometimes controlled by yet other translations. For example, in one place he tells us that a pseudo-Dionysian passage "is the text of an old translation, which is amended by the new one, and runs thus. . ."²⁴ He apologizes for the "translatio vitiosa" of Chrysostom he must employ in the *Catena aurea*.²⁵ For use in this same opus, he later informs us, "I had some of the commentaries by Greek doctors translated for me into Latin."²⁶ Translations had their own dangers:

Though a passage may read correctly in the Greek tongue, it may be otherwise after translation into Latin [here he gives an example] . . . Hence it is part of a good translator's duty . . . to preserve the idea while changing the mode of expression according to the genius of the language into which he is translating.²⁷

²² For example, *In epistolam ad Titam, cap. III, lec. 2* (Vives XXI: 552-53): "In Scripta sacra secundum veritatem nihil est contrarium; set si aliquid appareat contrarium vel est quia non intelligitur, vel quia corrupta sunt vitio scriptorum." And in the *De malo, q. XV, a. 2, ad 11* (Vives XIII: 562), "littera illa corrupta est: non enim debet dici 'quorum venialis est turpitud' set 'quorum turpitude est venalis.'"

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 671: "Libentius velle habere Homiliae Chrysostomi super Evangelium S. Mattaei." Spicq, *op. cit.* p. 308, remarks: "Or il disposait à cette époque de la traduction latine de Burgondio de Pise . . . qui correspond a peu près au texte actuel de Migne." Mandonnet tells us (*loc. cit.*) Thomas had Moerbeke help him in preparing free versions of the sense of Chrysostom from the original for his *Catena*, but that like his contemporaries he also used the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* (on which see text *infra*).

²⁴ *S. th., Ia, q. 56, a. 1, ad 1*; he quotes and compares the two translated sentences, concluding by "saving" even the false translation.

²⁵ *Epistola dedicatoria, ad finem.*

²⁶ "Et ut magis integra et continua praedicta sanctorum expositio reddetur, quasdam expositiones Doctorum graecorum in latinum feci transferri" (*Catena aurea in Marcum, epistola dedicatoria, ad finem.*)

²⁷ *Prooemium, Contra errores Graecorum* (Vives XXIX: 344-45). Grabmann (*op. cit.*, p. 46) holds Thomas had some knowledge of Greek; Spicq (*op. cit.*, p. 198) however says: "Comme il ignore le grec et l'hébreu, il ne connaît donc les variantes des manuscrits [scripture] que par ses devanciers." Certain it is that he could easily have learned either language in

Elsewhere he remarks on philological²⁸ or idiomatic difficulties.²⁹

Among the special translations he caused to be made, the most famous are those of Aristotle. He rejected the versions used by his master Albert the Great, and had two gifted confreres in his Order, William of Moerbeke and Henry of Brabant, prepare for him a personal translation of the body of Aristotle's works. This, says Ueberweg, was "executed with such literal fidelity, as in many instances to enable us to infer from their form what was the reading of Codices."³⁰

IV

What of a critical attitude to the contents of his documents, once in hand? Besides the literal intent of the author, Thomas warns, the context must be consulted, and at times the historical framework.³¹ We must not do violence to a text.³² At the end of a masterly critical analysis, he rebukes Averroes as a "corrupter" of Aristotelian doctrine and includes as well those who analyze Aristotle without being really familiar with the great man's originals.³³

Thomas could distinguish Aristotelian teaching from Avicen-

France or Italy had he deemed it necessary; he would still have needed the services of Moerbeke's advanced knowledge. Bernard Gui tells us that some of Thomas' works were translated into Greek by his contemporary, the Languedoc Dominican Guillaume Bernard (+ca. 1317).

²⁸ A good example is the long disquisition in his *In lib. I sententiarum, dist. XXIII, a. 1* (and *passim* in the preceding explanation of the text). See also the linguistic cautions with which he classes his *Contra errores Graecorum* (Vives XXIX: 37-73). Also the *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia Dei, q. X, a. 1, ad 8 and 9* (Vives XIII: 294).

²⁹ E.g. *S. th., II-IIae, q. XXIII, a. 2, ad 1*: "Hic enim modus loquendi consuetas est apud Platonicos, quorum doctrinis embutus fuit Augustinus; quod quidam non advertentes, ex verbis ejus sumpserunt occasionem errandi."

³⁰ *History of Philosophy*, tr. G. S. Morris from 4th German edn., 2 vols.; New York: Scribner, Armstrong and Co., 1876; I: 150.

³¹ *S. th., IIIa, q. 16, a. 8, ad 2* (an author may be verbally wrong "causa brevitatis" but correction is supplied by the "subintelligenda" intention). *IIIa, q. 66, a. 8* (historical circumstances influenced the manner of baptizing, and ecclesiastical documents are thus explained). See also the *prooemium* to the *Contra errores Graecorum*.

³² See e.g. *S. th., Ia, q. 39, a. 4, ad 4*.

³³ *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas* (Vives XXVII: 334): "unde merito supra diximus eum [Averroes] Philosophiae Peripatetice perversorem. Unde mirum est quomodo aliqui solum commentum Averrois videntes, pronuntiare praesumunt, quod. . ."

nan interpretation,³⁴ correct Lombard, reprimand Chrysostom,³⁵ and arrange his sources in a scale of values. It was his conviction that

in choosing or rejecting an opinion, one should not be influenced by his like or dislike for its author, but should look rather to its truth. . . We must be led by the more certain argument.³⁶

His practice conformed to this theory, whether the source was Jewish, Islamic, Christian or pagan, friend or foe. He adopts Augustine's words as his own: "I so read as not to deem anything in their works to be true, merely on account of their having so thought and written, whatever may have been their holiness and learning."³⁷

Most remarkable of all perhaps were the several keen critical decisions on the authenticity of manuscripts. This talent would win him the admiring praise of later researchers, including the Maurists. He was the first to discover the inauthenticity of the famed pseudo-Aristotelian *Liber de causis*, by comparing it with the source from which it had been adapted. Proclus' *Elements of Theology* (in Moerbeke's translation of 1268).³⁸ He rejected the *Liber de unitate et uno* credited to Boethius and remarked on

³⁴ *Quaestiones disputatae de potentia Dei*, q. III, a. 17 (Vives XIII: esp. 105-06).

³⁵ S. th., IIIa, q. 27, a. 4, ad 3 (of this opinion that the Blessed Virgin acted on two occasions, including Cana, "solum ex vana gloria," Thomas firmly but modestly asserts: "in verbis illis Chrysostomus excessit"—adding "possunt tamen expnii" and cleverly proceeding to do so.

³⁶ In XII libros metaphys., lib. XII, lec. 9 (in Vives lec. 6; XXV: 213): "in eligendis opinionibus vel repudiadis non debet duci homo amore vel odio introducentis opinionem sed magis ex certitudine veritatis, idea dicet quod oportet amare utrosque, scilicet eos quorum opinionem sequimur, et eos quorum opinionem repudiamus. Utrique enim studuerunt ad inquirendam veritatem, et nos in hoc adjuverunt. Set tamen oportet nos 'persuaderi a certioribus'. . ." See his practical conclusions, for example, in In lib. II sententiarum, dist. XII, q. 1, (Fathers disagree on a theological point); and *ibid.*, dist. XIV, q. 1, a. 2 (philosophers, and the Fathers following them, disagree on a philosophical point).

³⁷ S. th., Ia, q. 1, a. 8 ad 2. And the more general principles in the In primos libros de coelo et mundo expositio, lib. I, lec. 22.

³⁸ "Erst Thomas von Aquin hat, nachdem die *Stoicheiois theologiche* selbst übersetzt war, den wahren Ursprung und Charakter des *Liber de causis* bestimmt" (M. Grabmann, "Die Proklosübersetzungen des Wilhelm von Moerbeke und ihre Verwertung in der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters," ch. XVI of *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik*, Munich: 1926-1936, 2 vols.; I: 413).

differences of style which led him to conclude "non est Boetii."³⁹ He denied Augustine's authorship of the *De spiritu et anima*, inclining to credit the work to "some Cistercian"; centuries later the Maurists traced it to the Cistercian Alcher of Clairvaux (ca. 1165).⁴⁰

Similar incidents, while neither so striking nor so original, betray his awareness of the possibility of textual fraud. A Strabo gloss *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae* is denounced: "non est liber authenticus, sed falso adscribitur Augustino."⁴¹ The *Liber de ortu Salvatoris*, the *Liber de infantia Salvatoris*, and the *Liber de intelligentiis* are stamped as apocryphal.⁴² The *De ecclesiae dogmatibus* he knows is not Augustine's and assigns it at least once to Gennadius of Marseilles.⁴³

But we must repeat: Thomas Aquinas was a man of his age. For all his principles and genius, he accepted many a spurious text. A man can only walk so far, no further, in advance of his contemporaries in such matters. As he himself would have put it, knowledge is the work of many generations. So we find in one group of Trinitarian texts, three of five Jerome citations inauthentic, and eleven of 112 Augustine references. Durantel has counted for us in the *Summa theologica*, no less than 1702 pseudo-Dionysian citations. Scotus Erigena is quoted as Bede, St. Bernard as St. Gregory, Nemesius as Gregory of Nyssa, Hugh of St. Cher as Jerome; a work by Rufinus of Aquileia is referred to Pope Leo the Great and one by Fulgentius to Augustine. The *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* which he used was not by Chrysostom but by an anonymous monophysite, semi-arian

³⁹ *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, quodl. IX, a. 6, ad 2. *De spiritualibus creaturis*, a. 1, ad 21: "liber . . . non est Boetii, ut ipse [alibis ipse solus] stilus indicat." Its author was Dominic Gundisalvus Segoviensis, ca. 1150.

⁴⁰ *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate*, q. XV, a. 1, ad 1; also q. XXV, a. 3, ad 2; and q. XXVI, a. 5, ad 7. *Quaestio disputata de anima*, a. 9, ad 1; also a. 12, ad 1 ("dicitur eujusdam Cisterciensis"); and a. 19, ad 3. *De spiritualibus creaturis* a. 3, ad 6; and a. 11, ad 2. *Summa theologica*, Ia, q. 77, a. 8, ad 1 ("eadem facilitate contemnitur, qua dicitur"); and q. 79, a. 8, ad 1.

⁴¹ *S. th.*, III a, q. 45, a. 3, ad 2.

⁴² *S. th.*, III a, q. 35, a. 6, ad 3 (on the *De ortu*). *Ibid.*, q. 36, a. 4, ad 3 (for the *De infantia*. *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, quodl. VI, a. 19 ad finem (for the *De intelligentiis*).

⁴³ *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, quodl. XII, a. 10. On the other hand, an example of his ignorance of an important source is pointed out by J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, part 1, vol. I (London: Macmillan and Co., 1890), p. 102n.

bishop. The commentaries on the epistles of Paul, which Thomas quotes as from St. Ambrose, are the work of the anonymous Ambrosiaster (possibly Hilary the Deacon.) A serious case was that of the *Liber de vera et falsa poenitentia* which Thomas reverently accepted as Augustinian and incorporated into his sacramental theology. It is difficult to say just how far his theology of the sacraments may suffer from this and similar historical defects. His lack of acquaintance (again, a mark of his time) with the decrees of the second Council of Orange, which had acquired oecumenical force by papal disposition, deprived him of a valuable source on the theology of grace.

It is only fair to add that, in a few cases at least, he may have known quotations were not authentic but felt the incident did not warrant a formal correction. Then too, where his pseudo-pigraphical documents are adapted after the fashion of "expōnere reverenter" described above, little if anything is lost. Works like the *Opus imperfectum*, besides, were not without distinct merits of their own; the Pauline commentaries of Ambrosiaster have been called "an excellent work" and perhaps "the best that was written before the sixteenth century."¹⁴ But the fact remains that Aquinas was hampered as much by the undeveloped critical sense of his age as he was by its weak historical sense.

At any rate, we have seen enough in this essay to conclude that he was neither naive in his attitude toward sources, nor a-prioristic in his attitude toward history. To suggest that his historico-critical defects were such as to introduce serious flaws one into his theological structure, would be to introduce a question not facilely answered and beyond the scope of this paper. If his was not *our* critical scholarship, it was yet a critical scholarship. With a deep respect for the teachings of the past and for the lessons to be learned for his profession from ancient customs or law, he sought these diligently in sources as pure as he could obtain (all things considered), compared and synthesized with loving insight and often with regard for their historical context. All this comprises what Grabmann has termed Aquinas' "positivistic-historical" mind.¹⁵ It was not only in things speculative that Thomas was a master, but also to a surprising degree in things empirical.

¹⁴ J. Schaefer, "Ambrosiaster," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, I: 406.

HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF MODERN JUDAISM

WILLIAM LESTER
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

The Messiah was the *raison d'être* of Judaism. The very purpose of the chosen people was to prepare the world for Christ; that is, to keep alive faith in his coming, and to be the race from which he would be born. The coming of the Messiah meant the fulfillment of the prophecies and the perfection of Judaism. Our Lord came and the Jews had the choice of accepting or rejecting him. In accepting him they acknowledged Judaism and its very foundations as being true. In rejecting him they actually forsook Judaism because fundamental to it was this promise of a Redeemer; hence, by denying Jesus to be the Christ they would eventually have to deny the prophecy and, finally, their entire religion. The issue, of course, was not at that time evident to the majority. Some accepted Christ and knew him as the perfection of Judaism, but the Jewish nation as a whole, though they rejected him, still held to the messianic prophecy; but what they were clinging to was an empty promise which sooner or later would be revealed as such and when it was, the illogical position of keeping Judaism would also become apparent. Neither the emptiness nor the bad logic appeared at first; for the Jewish leaders, awaiting a Messiah who would restore the kingdom of David and Solomon, not a meek Christ who would preach a spiritual kingdom, were blinded by their hatred for Our Lord and led their people to look further for the Promised One. The Jews persisted in their blindness as long as they could still hope for the fulfillment of the prophecies. Up until the seventeenth century a "Messiah" like Sabbatai Zevi would arise and win the enthusiasm of the Israelites, only to be revealed finally as an impostor. And even to this day the Orthodox Jews look forward to a personal Messiah who will restore their nation to its former glorious heights. Nevertheless, the majority of Jews by degrees have become conscious of the emptiness of the prophecies and the consequent illogicality of keeping their old religion. Yet they have desired with all their hearts to retain Judaism. Thus their problem became to reconcile somehow truth and falsity; to keep the prophecies yet deny them; to rationalize somehow their forced denial of the principle of contradiction. The slip was slowly, naturally, and imperceptibly into historic evolution until now when it is quite openly recognized by the Reform group.

All meaning of Judaism lay in the fact that it was a preparation for Christianity. After Christ, it became mere external form, a hollow shell which would gradually crumble. In 70 A. D. Titus added to the deterioration by driving the people from Jerusalem.¹ Upon the resulting diaspora the Jews lost their sacrifice, the *sine qua non* of religion, and the guidance of a supreme authority. Each synagogue became autonomous and though its rulers for a while retained sufficient respect to settle questions for their own flock, even this authority disintegrated slowly into subjectivism. What saved Judaism from a sudden, complete break-up was the majority of the people holding so obstinately and blindly to their beliefs. However, all that remained for the Jew in the dispersion was law and ritual and a certain satisfaction at times with the appearance of progress whenever the rabbis added still more minutiae to his already parched way of religion and life.

Moses ben Maimon, one of the greatest theologians in the twelfth century, purposed to back the faith of Judaism with reason. The result was further disintegration which could be foreseen, for the test of reason would soon uncover the emptiness of so many practices and the contradictions between belief and fact. But the process of destruction would be retarded if the theologian, as Maimonides, firmly held in good faith to his religion and therefore thought that the contradictions were not actually real but somehow interpretable. Rabbi Moses on his part explained, as so many generations had, the unfulfillment of the messianic prophecies in a rather harmless manner through the uncertainty of the exact time for their completion; nevertheless, disillusioned about prophecies in general, he laid down certain principles which would eventually take their toll: to prophesy is natural to man with intellectual faculties highly developed; for such a man not to prophesy is a privation, he is withheld by God; prophecies are not true unless they are fulfilled. Then too from the fact that Judaism was without sacrifice, he reasoned that sacrifice could not be really necessary and, consequently, prayer of the individual must be all important. A great step toward subjectivism. At the same time he criticized what

¹ Looked upon in the light of historicism by a leader of Reform Jewry this scattering of the Jewish people marks the final consummation of historical progress of Judaism from a religion of a nation to a religion of the individual. Samuel S. Cohon, *What We Jews Believe*, (Cincinnati: Department of Synagogue and School Extension of the Union of American Hebrew Congregation, 1931), pp. 75-6.

little authority existed when he spoke of the authors of the old standard prayers, compiled mostly from the prophets, as obviously stupid to all intellectual people because they committed sin greater than slander by describing and referring to God attributes far below him. No one realized that this criticism, based on the Rabbi's philosophy of knowledge, was not just; and so the intellectuals taking their cue from him lost still more reverence for authority and lapsed deeper into subjectivism.

Despite the fact that he did sow seeds for later disruption Maimonides succeeded for a time in giving Judaism some enthusiasm. He composed the code of beliefs which the Orthodox hold to this day. They all begin with a firm "I believe," and included among them is still the credence in the promised Messiah.

Later, in the fifteenth century, Joseph Albo proceeded further along the path of rationalism when he cut the Maimonidian code to three articles: existence of God, revelation, and divine retribution. He claimed that the other beliefs were superfluous. Rationally, he said, they came down to just these three. The third substituted for the Messiah because the Messiah should have come but had not, and Maimonides has proved that a prophecy is true only if it turns out; therefore, the messianic prophecy was false.

At the time Albo had little influence among his people; he preached a Judaism too far advanced for the majority, and especially for those who lived in ghettos. Life confined to the ghetto threw the Jew for solace back on the old traditions of his people and kept him at a very low cultural level. His education could be no broader than his little colony. The Talmud containing the five books of Moses and a supplement of commentaries which also prescribed rituals of religion and life even to small details was the hub of his education. From the Talmud he likewise learned the "true" side of Christianity: how Jesus was a legendary character and an impostor who justly deserved his punishment; that Christianity teaches love but so contradictorily hates Jesus' kinsmen. Forced into the ghetto the Jew developed a persecution complex of looking towards the evils done him yet never towards himself as a possible occasion of hatred. There too he was stamped deeper than ever with the characteristics of his nation. Thrown upon God for his only consolation, and that meant the God of Orthodox Jewry, he sought to please him by the exact fulfillment of all ceremonies and customs; but these

more than anything made a Jew a Jew. There also old Judaism in which men held stubbornly and blindly to their beliefs and to the hope of a personal Messiah would revive, and rabbis would labor with new zeal to interpret and add more detail to dry law.

Only after Albo by three centuries did Moses Mendelssohn, a man learned in Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*, lead the break from the ghetto and with it the break from old Judaism.² He broke free by writing the book *Phaedon* which made him famous almost overnight. People realized that perhaps the Jew could do something. Then through the influence of the French Revolution and Catholic writers, who were constantly advocating Jewish liberty, the Jews won most, if not all, of their political freedom. They began to mix in a culture far above the narrow confines of the Talmud and the rabbis of the ghetto. Then, since mixing with the world demanded that they cease to be so conspicuously Jewish, they had to drop many legislated customs which, as we said before, composed Judaism. At any rate the Jews, with their newly found freedom and their desire to keep it by mingling well with people, accepted the progressive Judaism of Joseph Albo and began further rationalization.

Mendelssohn led the way with his book *Jerusalem*. In it he boldly advanced the new Judaism: it is no longer revealed religion, but revealed legislation; its first precept is not one of belief or disbelief but of doing and abstaining from doing. He claimed that in this scorned religion anyone may think, conjecture, or err as he pleases without incurring in the least the guilt of heresy. He refused to have in Judaism any standards or clearly defined principles. Furthermore, he tried to give it life by departing from many rigid, onerous laws since it was impossible for a liberated Jew to live in a country and associate with others, and still keep all precepts and rituals. He wanted Judaism as subjective as possible, and in this he was only drawing further conclusions from Maimonides and Joseph Albo. Albo had discredited every belief but three and left these weakly substantiated. He had no real proof for anything. Hence it took only an intellectual to discard all belief and stress merely the laws which alone the Jews wonderfully cherished. But these, too, were embraced more through ingrained custom than reason and therefore were subject to modification, at least if the people could

² cf. Stephen S. Wise, *As I See It*, (New York: Jewish Opinion Publication Corp., 1944), pp. 35-7.

be brought to look at them rationally. This was Mendelssohn's unwitting contribution to the disintegration of his religion.

Thus under Moses Mendelssohn's influence and the new freedom, Judaism headed rapidly into a purely natural religion. Father Bonsirven in his monumental work sums it up well: the more the Jews receive political freedom, the more they free themselves spiritually; and the more they mix with Christians, the more they desert their traditional religion, abandon their observances, frequent the Synagogue seldom if at all, neglect or totally forget prayer, yet, they still remain attached to their Judaism as to a good family which a person does not wish to leave though he can no longer keep all of its beliefs and customs. The liberals among them take Judaism and adapt it to modern culture. To this end they delete from their books of prayers all affirmation of the supernatural so that now they can claim a purely natural religion. The dogma of the resurrection is replaced by theories on the immortality of the soul and future life. Philosophy has supplanted revelation. The majority believe not in a personal Messiah but in an age when all men will be united through the same culture, through the same sentiment of love and veneration for the One God, the God of justice and charity.³

Followers of the new Judaism hail Moses Mendelssohn as their father. Under his leadership the Jews, who would be intellectual and liberated, gradually broke from Orthodox Jewry with its Maimonidian code of belief; they established on the principles of historic evolution Reform and Conservative Judaism which differ little from each other except that the latter is more reluctant to break in practice from the old religion. Today less than one fourth of the Jews belong to the Orthodox whereas over one half are affiliated with the Reform and that majority was obtained only within the last fifty years.

With the great impetus that Mendelssohn gave his religion along naturalistic lines it became a matter of only a very short time before it would turn to historicism. The Jews, tenaciously holding to their religion as true, were being forced to meet the contradiction of facts. To explain how a thing can be true and not true at the same time and under the same respect, they turned unconsciously and naturally to historic evolution. It took some time before they saw and confessed it as the guiding fundamental,

³ J. Bonsirven, S.J., *Le Judaïsme Palestinien*, 2 vols., Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1934, vol. II, pp. 323-4.

and even now they are not fully aware that it contains a whole philosophical system. At least the greater part of the liberal Jewish leaders would deny that any philosophy is a handmaid of their theology. Certainly they do not carry evolution through consistently though it prevails on the whole.

Among the first to recognize the trend of historic evolution was Claude Montefieor, a Reform leader. Revelation for him was evolving, dynamic. In the Memorial Hall, Temple Emanu-El, New York City is the memorial tablet of the father of American Jewry, Isaac M. Wise, on which is written, ". . . a religion without mysteries or miracles, rational and self-evident, eminently human, universal, liberal and progressive." The same idea was expressed almost explicitly in the ten articles summarizing the teaching of the Reform group which held a conference in November of 1885 at Pittsburg. In the fourth article they claimed to have outgrown Mosaic laws because the laws were for the training of the people of Palestine in their former surroundings; and therefore, since only moral laws are divine, social, political and sacerdotal statutes inconsistent with modern habits and views can and are to be rejected. According to the fifth article progress has nullified the minute laws on food and dress. No longer do the Mosaic-Rabbinical laws on diet, purity, and dress imbue modern Jews with the spirit of priestly holiness; and moreover, their observance today would rather obstruct moral and spiritual elevation. As Father Bonsirven noted, their sixth article changed a personal Messiah to a messianic era of peace, justice, and love among men, the goal of their historical progress. Included also is that they expect no return to Palestine nor the reinstatement there of a Jewish state.⁴ The seventh and tenth articles described the modernization of Judaism as an ever growing, progressive and rational religion now in a period of transition from blind belief in authority to a rational and humanitarian way of looking at things.

After this first summation of principles there appeared men who would lead the thought of the next major assembly some fifty years later. One of them, a professor of Jewish theology of the Hebrew Union College which is *the* seminary for the Reform party, formulated what his people believe. According to Professor Cohon all religions are true, though some are more advanced

⁴ This surrender of Palestine has since become outmoded. Witness the rather successful Zionist movement composed mainly of Reform Jews to set up Israel.

than others. Just as each nation expresses itself in a language peculiar to itself so a people, due to environment, culture, climate, etc., express their feeling for the religious in a distinctive religion. This last is his fundamental tenet.⁵ Religion for him like art, culture, and science grows out of man's needs and develops through his experience.⁶ There is no such thing as revealed religion. Creeds are merely the summation of the best convictions and spiritual ideals which appear to be essential to the religious life of the group; and though the creeds at first sight seem to be eternal and unchanging truths, upon examination they can be seen as products of historical growth. They are but "centers of relative constancies in a changing world of experience."⁷ Reform Judaism therefore is not a revolutionary break with the past but an evolutionary product of the historic faith.⁸

In developing his ideas Doctor Cohon has many fences to straddle and consequently seems to be inconsistent and self-contradictory. For instance, he urges the destruction of Judaism despite himself when he advocates absolute equality with other people, complete freedom from any trace of the ghetto, so that there will be no distinction between Jews and non-Jews;⁹ because according to his own principle it was just their peculiar environment, culture, climate, and so forth which fashioned Judaism in the first place into a distinctive religion; and now he desires to destroy its root source. At another time he seems to be contradicting himself when he states that doctrinally Reform has kept untouched the three first principles of Judaism as expressed by Albo: God's existence, revelation, and retribution;¹⁰ but then pages later the best argument, and it can hardly be called an argument, which he gives for the existence of God is that man postulates Him as that which best satisfies his aspiration after truth and holiness, and which offers the most consistent conception at this time of the cosmos.¹¹ Concerning revelation he states quite definitely that there is no such thing as revealed religion;¹² the Bible is only transient truth, the human aspiration to God of a people;¹³ prophecy too is merely human.¹⁴ Retribution he dismisses as being unable to stand up under the analysis of modern thought.¹⁵ He favors the immortality of the soul, but even at

⁵ Cohon, *op. cit.*, pp. 11, 27-8, 30, 68.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 14-5.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-8.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-3.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 14-5.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 116, 191.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 131-3.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 182.

that it is more like Cicero's immortality of fame than true incorruptibility.¹⁶ Thus after stating that Reform, of which he is a leading exponent, has left untouched the doctrine of Albo, he then proceeds to destroy the hallowed, article by article.

Progress like Cohen's in the theory of evolution showed itself in 1939 when the Reform Jews at Columbus formulated again a definite platform outlining what they now thought were the basic principles of Judaism. The first article dealing with the nature of Judaism stated that this religion is the "historical religious experience" of the Jewish people; that the Reform Jew recognizes the "principle of progressive development" in religion and applies consciously this principle to spiritual as well as to cultural and social life. The fourth article like the fourth of the 1885 platform rejected the laws of the Torah because they are "products of historical processes." The fifth article concerning the Messiah remain substantially the same as the sixth except that now they consider the messianic era of universal brotherhood their "historic task."

During the years the Jews not only progressed in doctrine but also in small practical things. Family pews are being installed in the synagogue. Women are no longer obliged to sit in a separate, secluded and humble place. Men pray with heads uncovered, not orientally as had been their custom. Wealthy temples look for more comfort and ventilation and the acoustics of the perfect lecture hall or auditorium rather than for a devotional environment. In everything religious, Jews are becoming less and less Jewish.

The evolution taught by modern Judaism is philosophically connatural with that of Communism. One teaches it primarily in the field of religion, the other in economics; but the principle which governs Marx's economics also interprets to a great extent the rest of life for his followers whereas the religious principle of Judaism, though of necessity it must infiltrate too, man being a rational animal, has not yet consciously gone as far. Both Communism and Judaism are alike too in their final goal. After the "expropriation of the expropriators" all men will share equally in a perfect economic condition: when the messianic epoch comes all men will be brothers in the same religious feeling of peace, justice, and love.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 181-6.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

MEDIAEVAL

From Constantine to Julian: A History of the Early Church, III,
by Hans Lietzmann, translated by B. L. Woolf. New York.
Scribner's. 1950. pp. 340. \$5.50.

The late Hans Lietzmann (d. 1943), whose merits in many fields of historical interest were very great, unfortunately also suffered the handicaps of environment and training, Wittenberg, Jena, Bonn, Berlin. In 1924 he became Harnack's successor in the Berlin lectureship the latter had made so famous, as the out-post of a thorough-going rationalism. Hence it is not to be expected that Leitzmann's general Church History is free of doctrinal prepossessions. For those (few) who are placed in the position of being able to check his sources at a moment's notice, and are therefore independent on his "lead," his work will be found to be a graphic narrative, with all the appearance of fairness and objectivity. To those not so placed a wholly erroneous outlook may be imparted in a colorless phrase.

This is a serious charge. I believe one clear instance will suffice to caution busy teachers of history against the danger.

At pages 88-89, with reference to the Council of Arles (314), we have this short passage: "The council sent a report of its conclusions to Silvester, bishop of Rome, whose absence it deeply regretted. At the same time it requested that he would make these conclusions universally known, especially as he 'was the head of the largest province': obviously he was regarded with honor as one of the western presidents." This is a presentation of the "facts" from an extremely distorted anti-papal position.

The original Latin of the letter may be consulted, for instance, in Mansi's *Collectio Amplissima* (ii, 469-70), and an English version is printed in full in the first volume of Kidd's *Documents Illustrative of the Early History of the Church* (New York: Macmillan, 1920). To read only the first sentence is enough to dispell that "democratic" attitude towards "one of the western presidents": "Being united by the common tie of charity" (say the Fathers of Arles) "and by that unity which is the bond of our mother, the Catholic Church, . . . we salute thee with the reverence which is thy due, most glorious Pope." This "most beloved brother" was sorely missed in the action of the Council,

"but since you were by no means able to leave that region, where the Apostles daily sit, and their blood without ceasing bears witness to the glory of God," the Fathers went on without him to make certain decisions: "we also agreed to write to you who hold [the government of] the greater dioceses that by you especially they (the conciliar decrees) should be brought to the knowledge of all. . ." (op. cit. 254-55).

Here, by reading a singular for a plural, and passing over everything else, an impression could be created of a Church without primacy or papal authority. The book is the more dangerous, because the thrust is made in secret.

Gerald Ellard, St. Mary's College, Kansas.

Anales de Historia Antigua y Medieval, published by the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, University of Buenos Aires. University of Buenos Aires. Buenos Aires. Amorrortu e Hijos. 1950. pp. 272.

The *Anales* are a scholarly publication of *miscellanea* relative to Ancient and Mediaeval History. The present issue includes ten articles, most of which are well documented, original contributions. Especially interesting are those by C. Sanchez-Albornoz, Lisardo Rubio, Alberto Freixas, and S. I. de Mundo. The first concerns "The Process of the Romanization of Spain from the Scipios to Augustus;" the second "The Balbos and the Roman *Imperium*;" the third "Themes of Procopius of Cesarea;" the fourth "Books and Libraries in the Statutes of Mediaeval Universities." Although not entirely original, the latter makes some interesting points. University libraries were already developing in the 13th, definitely established by the 14th, and well organized by the 15th Century. To supply students with required texts, copies were rented successively in sections, or "*peciae*," of about eight pages at a time. The students would copy each section, then exchange it for the succeeding one. Prices were fixed by the university authorities. Book I of the *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, for instance, containing 56 "*peciae*," cost a total of 3 solidi, according to a 1286 regulation of the University of Paris. The same source lists rental prices of the *De proprietatibus rerum* of Bartholomew Anglicus and the *De naturis rerum* of Alexander Neckam, together with those of works by Bernard, Augustine, Simplicius, and Themistius.

Daniel D. McGarry, Saint Louis University.

MODERN

A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution, by John Hall Stewart. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1951. pp. x, 818. \$6.00.

The Incidence of the Emigration during the French Revolution, by Donald Greer. Cambridge. Harvard University Press. 1951. pp. 173. \$3.00.

Generals and Politicians, by Jere Clemens King. Berkeley and Los Angeles. University of California Press. 1951. pp. 294. \$3.50.

Modern France, edited by Edward Mead Earle. Princeton. Princeton University Press. 1951. pp. xiv, 522. \$6.00.

These are four kinds of books aimed at giving the student historical information about modern France. Stewart's work is a collection of documents; Greer's study is a statistical investigation; King's book is a study of personalities set in the background of World War I; and *Modern France* is a collection of twenty-eight essays on problems of the Third and Fourth Republics. Each is a competently done book, and each in its own way contributes to the student's knowledge of modern France.

Everyone teaching history on the college level decides—about every third year—to burn all textbooks and send his students to documentary sources. *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution* will delight those professors of the French Revolution now in that frame of mind. It fills the need of an adequate collection in English of official governmental documents from the revolutionary period. In it are most of the decrees, laws, and constitutions analyzed in the textbooks but not hitherto brought together in one volume of English. There are 170 selections covering the period from the convocation of the Estates General in 1789 until the *Coup d'etat Brumaire* of 1799. One might wish for additional items, but within the limits imposed by a single volume Professor Stewart has selected his items judiciously.

Dr. Greer's study reveals both the strong points and the weaknesses of modern scientific scholarship in the field of history—which is the story of man's past, the story, therefore, of human beings rather than numbers. The author proposes to make a purely statistical survey of the social and geographic incidence of the emigration during the French Revolution. He is right in believing such a study is needed because of the popularly ac-

cepted idea that only nobles and upper clergy emigrated. The study is well done. Dr. Greer relies primarily on the departmental lists of emigres compiled according to law. Because of time and weather and human failings of the compilers these sources are not perfect. The author therefore supplements them with various data available to the industrious, trained scientific historian.

The study is objective, methodical, easy to follow. The conclusions are judicious, and they never go beyond the evidence. There are 108 pages of text, thirty pages of tables, and thirty-one pages of bibliography. The results are not surprising to those who have been using something more than Nesta Webster for information about the emigres, but it is good to have this information carefully compiled from all available sources instead of vaguely estimated. Dr. Greer finds that all social classes were represented among the emigres, and they came from all parts of France. Emigration was heaviest among the clergy, then among the peasants, the nobility, the working class, and the middle class in the order given. We find that peasant and working class emigration is heavy from the border areas. When these departments are lopped off, the picture generally given of clergy and nobility making up the mass of emigres remains substantially unchanged.

Dr. King's *Generals and Politicians* is a good analysis of the "conflict between France's High Command, Parliament and Government, 1914-1918." Whereas the English and we Americans had developed a consistent tradition of the supremacy of the civil government over the military by 1914, the French were a divided nation on this point—as on so many others. The Republican element held for civil control; the anti-Republican element held rather to the Napoleonic tradition. Dr. King traces the conflict between these forces from the time of Joffre's ascendancy at the beginning of the war to Clemenceau's at its end. In this analysis the author interweaves questions of policy, of recurring crises, and of personalities, all of which played parts in the conflict. The burden of this study is to follow the shifting of power from one group to another and back throughout the war, and to account as fully as possible for each shift.

Modern France is the kind of book which is becoming commoner each year. Problems of recent history have become so complex and intricate that historians are forced to specialize in smaller areas in order to understand what they are doing. The result is that the easiest and safest way to give a general picture of a nation's development in modern times is to have each special-

ist paint his little area and then have an older man of general culture and background try to explain to the reader how these little pieces all fit together to form a general picture. This role falls to Andre Siegfried in *Modern France*. There are six essays on the decline of the French *elan vital* and on French culture; ten are given to French domestic politics, six to analyzing social and economic problems, and six to French international affairs. The essays are competently done by professional historians, all of whom are sympathetic to France and hopeful of her future in world affairs. Moreover, they are generally well written, striking a happy combination of solid scholarship with a prose style readable by any literate person interested in the problems of modern France.

In some respects interpretative essays, like these in *Modern France*, are more satisfactory supplementary reading than documents. Most professors like to use both kinds of additional reading, and there is no doubt that for an understanding of contemporary history the essay by a competent scholar is more satisfactory than the bare document.

Thomas P. Neill, Saint Louis University.

Die Jesuiten: Geschichte und Gestalt des Ordens, by Hubert Becher, S.J. Munich. Kösel Verlag. 1951. pp. 438.

Father Becher found time from a crowded schedule as Prefect of Studies and Professor of History and Philosophy at Alosiuskolleg in Godesberg on the Rhine to write a clear and well balanced synthesis of over four centuries of Jesuit history—from the foundation of the Order to the present. Readers of his numerous contributions to *Stimmen der Zeit* during the past fifteen years will recall the wide range of interest evident in them. This characteristic correlates purely Jesuit history with world wide events to a degree usually not attempted in so brief an account. Father Becher entered the Society of Jesus the year the First World War began, going into exile in order to be able to do so. His thirty-seven years as a Jesuit enables him to speak “as one having authority” on the spirit of the Order, its organization and government, the Spiritual Exercises and Constitutions. Twenty-five years in the class-room and on the lecture-platform have led him to devote a considerable portion of the book to education in the Order, its origin, evolution, problems, successes and failures.

When a new history of the Order is published, one naturally wonders, “Is this just another account with statistics more or

less brought up to date, or is it really some worthwhile contribution?" This history analyzes the spirit and internal organization as probably no other one volume work has yet attempted to do. Father Becher seems to have had two questions in mind as he penned its pages, "What gives the Order its evident vitality?" (nor does he forget to ask and answer this question for the years of its suppression but continued life in White Russia) and "What truth is there in the charge of essential changes in its spirit?" Any organization in the course of over four centuries must use new means and deal with new problems. Not a few—including some who were once members of the Order—have exaggerated such adaptations and then interpreted them as a betrayal of the original ideal.

Father Becher has read numerous anti-Jesuit pamphlets and books. Germany and the German language have had their full share of detractors. It seems necessary to keep this fact in mind while reading the book, for it alone justifies and explains why he takes time out in so crowded a synthesis to refute certain false ideas and claims concerning the evolution, scope, intention, nature and spirit of the Order.

The volume is divided into four main sections: foundation, expansion, suppression and restoration. The first is proportionately more detailed than the others (13-84); it sets forth the life of the founder and the founding of an Order to meet a few of the more pressing needs of the Church at the time. Father Becher's penchant for psychological analysis leads him to discuss at considerable length the charge of personal and corporate pride attributed to the Jesuits (80-84). On another question it may be doubted that any historian of the Order will fully agree with him, namely that by the mere fact that some women were allowed by St. Ignatius to take vows and be under the direction of Jesuits they in consequence became members of the Order, as though they were Jesuit Wacs! ("Es hat also in jener ersten Zeit wirklich die eine oder andere Jesuitin gegeben . . ."91).

The second section, which deals with the development of the Order, chronicles the generalates from that of the founder to Vitelleschi inclusively (87-146) and gives separate chapters to the sacred ministry, schools, foreign missions and learning. Father Becher's best study in this section is that on the schools of the Order and the training imparted in them. He is concerned with the question why the Order which in the first draft of its

constitutions expressly excluded schools as a means of apostolate should later have devoted so many of its most talented members and so much of its attention and energy to them.

He gives his readers credit for interest in the world of ideas and hence takes time out to discuss the main points at issue in the *De Auxiliis* controversy and in the heresy of the Jansenists.

The third section is the dramatic story of the struggle for survival and of the suppression. Here we find a clear presentation of the environment previous to the expulsion and suppression of the Jesuits. Their enemies succeeded in creating a world intellectually and ethically opposed to the Church, and then proclaimed that the Jesuits were decidedly out of place in this creation of theirs. The story of the suppression is the more impressive as it is told with the brevity of a death notice (313), although the events leading up to it are set forth in greater detail. Ricci's dying protestation is given the prominence it deserves (315-317). It was one of the tragedies of the times that Maria Theresia was not the heroine she is here made out to be (308 and 312). It is a pity Father Becher fails to see any humor in Frederick II's letter to Voltaire about protecting the Jesuits in his kingdom. The author seems unaware of the long cultural interchange between the Academy of St. Petersburg and the Jesuits in the East, especially in Peking, and the consequent part it played in inducing Catherine II to grant the Order a reprieve in her domains.

The narrative's tempo is stepped up considerably in the last section to crowd within eighty-five pages more than a century and a half of history with ever widening and more manifold apostolate. The growth of the Order since its restoration is prefaced by an excellent observation on the difference of the two periods—1540, its first birth and 1814, its second. Learning and schools, ministry and foreign missions are the concluding chapters to the study of the external growth of the Order and correspond to the similar chapters at the end of the study of the Old Society.

Much has had to be omitted in a compendium such as this; much more had to be condensed into a brief paragraph, at times into a short sentence or even into a single phrase (so for instance, the first Jesuit mission to North America that gave us the martyrs of Cumberland Island and the Rappahannock Valley). But the Order's position and contribution in every decisive period of European and world history is set forth clearly—in the Catholic

Reformation, the age of discovery and exploration in the New World and in the East, Bourbon supremacy, the age of Enlightenment; in the field of science and culture, in the foreign missions, the press, education and other forms of apostolic ministry.

The history is intended for the general public. It will give its readers a clear, well balanced, reliable and up-to-date account of the Order. Father Becher has no startling and challenging thesis to prove as did Fülöp-Miller; he has none of Father Brodrick's genial, humorous and anecdotal style; his eloquence is almost exclusively that of the facts he presents. The format, except for the forbidding black of the binding, is excellent; the printing is superb; the clearer Latin type replaces the more picturesque Gothic. There is an index of names but none of the subjects dealt with; a list of significant dates in Jesuit history follows the text; there are twenty-five pages of carefully chosen illustrations, of these particularly instructive is that of the Jesuit Observatory in Peking and of Father Buglio's Chinese translation of the *Summa of St. Thomas* as indicative of a "glorious might have been." Father Becher shows a more than Chestertonian disregard for bibliography and references; this is a very serious shortcoming in a book of this nature, which, it is hoped, subsequent editions will remedy.

There has been a more than pentecostal variety of nationalities which have had their part on the stage of Jesuit history. It is one of the outstanding merits of this work that national prejudice finds no part in it. The rapid growth of the Order in America is not forgotten and its apostolic work, particularly through its high schools, colleges and universities, is recorded here.

E. J. Burrus, Institute of Jesuit History, Rome.

AMERICAN

Lincoln and the Press, by Robert S. Harper. New York. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1951. pp. xii, 418. \$6.00.

In this useful contribution to the Lincolniana field there is presented for the first time a comprehensive treatment of the war time president's relations with the press. This study begins with Lincoln's letter to the *Sangamo Journal* in 1836 and concludes with his assassination twenty-nine years later. Lincoln's contacts with newspapers, editors and newsmen are narrated, although not always in detail. Interesting also is the material on the

political use Lincoln made of the press and on the attitudes of the press toward Lincoln. But this volume undertakes more in that it treats the position of innumerable newspapers toward the federal government during the Civil War years. Collateral to this is the sordid picture of imprisoned editors and impounded presses, the result of reaction of government authority to the amazingly large disloyal newspaper element in the North. In the broadest sense this book is a study of the problem of a free press during wartime, and more specifically, during civil war.

Mr. Harper attempts too much. If he had confined himself to a thoroughgoing study of Lincoln's relations with the press, as the title states, the treatment would not have been sketchy. The author chose, however, to take up the whole broad subject of press and government during the Civil War. This theme alone would fill volumes if adequately treated. But here, thrown together without evident order is a mass of undigested material, consisting mainly of newspaper quotations. Altogether some 250 newspapers are cited, a compilation which gives the student a ready reference for determining the Civil War political temperament of as many individual presses. Unfortunately, the book is primarily the product of newspaper research. Manuscript materials in quantity should have been used, but only The Robert Todd Lincoln Collection of the Papers of Abraham Lincoln is cited. The manuscript letters of editors, such as those of Horace Greeley in the New York Public Library, are fundamental to this subject. Nowhere does the book demonstrate skillful literary craftsmanship in terms of readability or organization. This is surprising in view of the fact that the author is a newspaperman of many years' experience. Although not the definitive study of the subject, this volume will be useful in that the material assembled is not readily available elsewhere.

Lincoln and the Press is well documented and has an adequate index. The bibliography is representative but by no means exhaustive.

LeRoy H. Fischer, Oklahoma A. & M. College.

The Blue and the Gray edited by Henry Steele Commager. Indianapolis. Bobbs-Merrill. 1950. 2 volumes. \$12.00.

This, "the story of the Civil War as told by participants," is essentially no different from any other collection of letters, diary excerpts, etc., in that all attempt to reveal the ordinary thoughts of ordinary men about ordinary war-time events.

However, in certain respects *The Blue and the Gray* is outstanding. One strong point is the arrangement of selections, in part, by campaigns and battles, giving the opportunity to the reader to compare soldier attitudes at different times and in different areas of combat. Another feature is the variety of sources used—war correspondents, nurses, chaplains, officers, enlisted men, and the variety of hangers-on with both Union and Confederate armies. The identification of events described and of the narrators is excellently done by the editor in brief introductions.

A bibliography affords the reader the chance to read further in the letters and diaries of any of the many authors used. The makeup of the volumes is attractive; illustrations and maps are excellent; inside covers and dust jackets are outstanding. An introduction by Douglas Southall Freeman adds to the value of the selections.

As mentioned above, the choice of excerpts is a matter of opinions and no two editors or reviewers would ever agree as to a method of choosing. However, the variety here is impressive. Again, no great generalizations can be made from the selections which appear since they represent the views of so many individuals of differing backgrounds. This reviewer was struck with the pervasive sense of humor—sometimes wry, sometimes salty, seldom vicious—which has become a trademark of the American GI and, incidentally, his greatest source of comfort. There are few heroics in the selections but a matter-of-fact realization of duty brings out a real heroism in men who clearly were civilians under their uniform.

The editor is to be congratulated on an outstanding job of collection and arrangement, and the publishers have also done their share of the partnership in excellent fashion.

Jasper W. Cross, Saint Louis University.

Confederate Leaders in the New South, by William B. Hesseltine. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1950. pp. 147. \$2.50.

This small volume presents the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History delivered at the University of Louisiana; it is the ninth volume of valuable contributions by eminent American historians. It opens by telling how through the "perfervid propaganda of the Republican North" during and after

the Civil War there ran the theme that "the 'leaders' of the South had misled the Southern people into a war for the defense of slavery." Quotations from the histories by Bryant and Abbott are given by way of evidence. Professor Hesseltine dissents of course from this view, though he does not note that politicians and others who helped form public opinion before the war and the leaders through the four years of struggle were not exactly identical groups. Once the war began soldiers became prominent figures, many winning an eminence that made them influential in post-bellum days. Among the civilian leaders of the war there were also some who had opposed secession, and were not among the prewar "leaders" whose influence Bryant, Abbott, and others doubtless magnified.

Professor Hesseltine's thesis, that the men who led the South after the war were the men that led it during the struggle, is interestingly and convincingly set forth. An instructive analysis is made of a group of 585 men, as regards activities before and after the war. It is a story in which figures have a special appeal. Of the more than fifty who, for example, went into voluntary exile, all but thirteen returned to the land of their birth. It was former officers in the U. S. army, who as a class found it necessary to find entirely new occupations. Though twenty of the total 104 became educators, and fourteen became civil engineers, no fewer than forty-four made their livings as farmers. Only one went back into the U. S. army, former Lieutenant General Joseph Wheeler, who became a major general of volunteers in the Spanish-American War, to be given presently the permanent commission of a brigadier.

As the leaders of the South were not completely united during the war, so they were divided afterward. Lee became the distinguished leader of the group who had really yielded the Southern cause at Appomattox, and who worked to build a spirit of harmony and understanding with the North, without indulging in debates of the issue that had been settled. Jefferson Davis on the other hand headed the irreconcilables. After commenting on his imprisonment, Hasseltine says, "Inadvertently, the Northern government had restored Davis to the affections of the Southern people."

In discussing Lee and the others who went into educational work, there are given surveys of the schools with which they were connected, their difficulties and their growth. In some instances a degree of prosperity came quicker than may have been

expected, revealing the deep vitality of the defeated states.

The last section of the book, "Politics and Business: The Leadership of Compromise," is in many ways the most appealing and illuminating. It covers a variety of matters not to be sketched in a few sentences, since it is itself a survey of what could be made into a larger book.

One must regret that there is no index; its absence lessens the value of the book as one for reference.

Kenneth P. Williams, Indiana University.

Grassland Historical Studies: Natural Resources Utilization in a Background of Science and Technology, by James C. Malin. Lawrence, Kansas. 1950. pp. 377. \$2.50.

This book, Volume One of Malin's Grassland Historical Studies is another excellent treatise on the mid-western grasslands by an author who thoroughly knows them as a region, and understands the part they played in the pattern of our Great Plains development. His treatment of the utilization of the natural resources of the grasslands in the various land-occupancy stages represents a noteworthy historio-geographical contribution. The development of a trade center (Kansas City) in relation to its upland or surrounding territory is vividly portrayed in great detail.

In his introduction, the author states that the settler who came to the American grasslands was tree-minded; that until the twentieth century, modern culture was largely based upon wood, supplemented to a certain degree by minerals. And since wood is lacking in the grasslands, minerals influence man's life more profoundly here than in the forest lands. Therefore, the introduction presents to the reader a "mineral-wood relationship."

Throughout the section on Geological Discovery, Malin implies that the motive behind the geological surveys were economic, with emphasis upon industrial ambitions. And since minerals must supplant wood in the grasslands, of major importance to the geologists of the early-middle nineteenth century was the finding of usable coal for railroad purposes. Very impersonally the author commends them upon their findings and points out their errors in prediction.

The prospective emigrant, he implies, was at first skeptical of the treeless soils but soon realized how readily they could be pre-

pared for farming, and how abundantly they yielded. These early farmers also beheld the natural advantages that the Kaw-Missouri junction possessed for a city—a capital of a new inland (grassland) empire extending across the Great Plains to the Rocky Mountains.

The remaining chapters, those dealing with the founding and growth of Kansas City until 1876, are what an urban geographer would term a "literary gem." Here, Malin considers the specific site (the Kaw-Missouri junction), the early founding, development of river trade, street, levee and dock construction, wagon-road connections with the west and southwest, and advantages that Kansas City possessed over rival grassland towns. He introduces by means of newspaper articles and excerpts from current "speeches" popular reactions during this period of growth, reactions to specific problems which must be met and overcome.

In the chapters on trade with the west and southwest he deftly employs the geography of transportation in its relation to the growth of Kansas City as a trade center, as an intrepot for the movement of draft animals and manufactured articles westward and southwestward, and the movement of grain, hides and skins eastward by returning load.

During this period of trade he indicates the keen insight of the business men of Kansas City when they favored the development of local manufacturing as an improvement to their intrepot service, and thus laid the groundwork for the present manufacturing industry.

A detrimental factor to the industrial growth of Kansas City was the inadequacy of river and wagon transportation in the movement of coal, but because of geographic advantages the city became the potential focal point for seven proposed railroad lines. So this era of early railroad building portended the movement of coal as well as raw materials for manufacture to Kansas City.

Although the economic development of the town was interrupted by the Civil War with its devastating guerilla activities, the resilience of the people enabled Kansas City to resume her course towards greater urban development in the immediate post-war period.

The appendix contains interesting and varied articles. Each chapter has a well-selected bibliography. The reviewer highly recommends this book to the casual reader in general and to the student of history and geography in particular.

John W. Conoyer, Saint Louis University.

Indian Agent, by Albert H. Kneale. Caldwell. Caxton Printers. 1950. pp. 429. \$5.00.

The inspiration for children's games has frequently been Indian and cowboy or soldier. Many Americans have acquired information, as children and adults, concerning the Indian from movies and novels. The result is that the Indian comes off second best, and to a certain extent, a second best that is unjust. You will even find that present day Indian children are so influenced by movies and novels that they make a lusty cheering section for the "hero" white against the "cruel" redskin.

Anyone who is interested in knowing something about the Indian problem and the Indian people will find the autobiographical oddyssey, *Indian Agent*, a fund of information. The author covers his life of thirty-five years among ten of the tribes of American Indians. His experience enables him to relate the humorous and the serious side of Indian life, which combine to make the book interesting reading.

Mr. Kneale shows in his writing that he is a man of Christian principles. To him the Indian is a human being who had a way of life which was forcibly taken away without being replaced by anything which was made acceptable. He, Mr. Kneale, does not hesitate to point out mistakes and mishandling by an inefficient, uninformed, changing bureaucracy which has meant a delay, if not a deliberate attempt to block any progress or development of the Indian people into acceptable American citizens.

One gathers from the book that the Indian problem as we know it today is of our own making. The understanding of it—and any consequent solution—will be greatly aided by a careful reading of this book. At the same time, anyone interested in the relation of personal experiences in unusual circumstances, plus serious consideration of the problems involved, will find this book worth reading.

S. E. Kalmaja, Rockhurst High School.

History Can Be Fun, by Munro Leaf. Philadelphia. Lippincott. 1950. pp. 63. \$1.75.

This is a book with a message: the nations of the world must live in harmony with one another if they are to arrive at a peaceful and happy existence. The author shows from history that when the rights of nations were respected, there was peace. But

when disagreement and war came, unhappiness and trouble followed. The children who have not yet studied history in school who read this book are made aware of the oneness of the human race and that the future good of mankind and of themselves depends on themselves and their cooperation with other peoples of the earth.

This book is a simple introduction to the history of Western civilization. It begins with pre-history—that period when, according to author Leaf, men communicated their ideas by grunts. We must remember, however, that the theory of evolution in reference to the human race remains merely a theory until proved to be a fact, and according to the data of science it is not a very probable theory.

History Can Be Fun contains in broad outline the principal elements that have gone to make up our Western civilization: the Egyptian, Greek, Roman, barbarian, Christian. Because of the book's limited scope, the treatment of these things must necessarily be sketchy. This perhaps explains Mr. Leaf's passing over in almost complete silence the contribution of the Catholic Church to our Western civilization, and the Protestant Revolt of the 16th century, which is at the root of the division of the nations of Western Europe. If a child is to understand the world in which he lives, this is necessary knowledge. The author's picture is inaccurate by omission. The reason why the nations are divided is because they are no longer one in spirit.

The book is illustrated with drawings by the author which brighten the text somewhat and will make the story of civilization somewhat more palatable for the young reader. There are, however, too many compound and complex sentences to make the text easy reading.

Robert W. Lambeck, Saint Louis University High School.

Teaching Social Studies in High Schools. Third Edition, by Edgar B. Wesley. Boston. D. C. Heath and Company. 1950. pp. 581. \$4.00.

Although this volume is designed as the Third Edition, it contains so many changes and innovations that it justly deserves its new title. The preceding editions were for both elementary and secondary levels. In addition to confining his work to the secondary school field, the author has completely reorganized the structure of the book, added several new chapters and revised others.

The book is divided into six parts. The first part, entitled Society and the Social Studies, deals with the functions and training of the social studies teacher and a brief analysis of contemporary society. In the second part the author considers the social studies curriculum, its development and objectives. A third section has to do with the learning process, treating such topics as adolescence, personality development, reading and study skills. Parts four and five, which are concerned with resources, equipment and methods of teaching, are especially helpful to the social studies instructor in the wealth of suggestions for improved classroom techniques. A concluding section deals with the problems of evaluation and measurement.

Dr. Wesley has presented a readable and well organized volume that will be a welcome addition to the professional library of the experienced social studies teacher. For the beginning teacher it should be required reading. It contains a wealth of information, practical suggestions and makes use of recent scholarship. One of the most commendable features of the book is the inclusion of many new annotated references at the end of each chapter. These references provide useful guides to more extensive investigation of the many problems discussed briefly in the text. A glossary of social studies' terms further enhances the value of the book. Dr. Wesley, who has made many contributions in the field of social studies instruction, has written a very useful and stimulation volume.

James F. Robinson, Saint Louis University High School.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is intended to be of service to teachers and students of history by presenting a fairly complete list of historical works announced or published since the previous issue of *The Historical Bulletin*. An asterisk denotes a review of the book in this or a later issue. Unfortunately sometimes the price and number of pages is not announced.

MEDIAEVAL

Augustine, St, *St. Augustine Against the Academics*. Newman. pp. 213. \$3.00. Number 12 in the Ancient Christian Writers series.

Beare, W., *The Roman Stage*. Harvard Univ. Pr. pp. 303. \$4.50.

Brooke, Zachary N., *A History of Europe, from 911 to 1198* (3rd ed.). Barnes and Noble. pp. 573. \$5.00.

Bullard, Sir Reader, *Britain and the Middle East, from the Earliest Times to 1950*. Longmans. pp. 195. \$2.00; text ed., \$1.60.

Bury, John B., *A History of Greece; to the Death of Alexander the Great*. 3rd ed. Macmillan. pp. 950. \$2.75.

Briggs, Lawrence P., *The Ancient Khmer Empire*. Amer. Philosophical Soc. pp. 295. \$6.00.

Elwood, Louie B., and Elwood, J. W., Jr., *The Rebellious Welsh*. Ward Ritchie Press. pp. 254. \$4.50.

Faroughby, Abbas, *The Bahrain Islands (750-1951)*. Verry, Fisher & Co. pp. 128. \$3.50.

Garth, Helen M., *Saint Mary Magdalene in Mediaeval Literature*. Hopkins. pp. 114. \$2.00.

Grant, Michael, *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius*. Amer. Numismatic Soc. pp. 217. \$5.00.

Kininmonth, Christopher, *The Children of Thetis*. Macdonald & Co. \$3.05.

Kitto, Humphrey D., *The Greeks*. Penguin Bks. pp. 256. \$0.35.

Laistner, Max L., *Christianity and Pagan Culture; in the Later Roman Empire*. Cornell Univ. Pr. pp. 151. \$2.50.

*Laufranc, *The Monastic Constitutions*. tr. David Knowles. Oxford Univ. Pr. pp. 345. \$3.50.

Lattin, Harriet, *The Peasant Boy Who Became Pope*. Schuman. pp. 190. \$2.50.

Lowe, E. A., ed., *Codices Latini Antiquae; a Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*. Oxford Univ. Pr. pp. 71. \$20.00.

Mitchell, Sydney K., *Taxation in Medieval England*. ed. Sidney Painter. Yale Univ. Pr. pp. 413. \$5.00.

Mott, George F., and Dee, Harold M., *An Outline-History of the Middle Ages from the Decline of the Roman Empire through the Roman Catholic Reformation*. 4th ed. Barnes & Noble. pp. 285. \$1.00.

Newell, Edward T., *The Alexander Coinage of Sicyon*. Amer. Numismatic Soc. pp. 41. \$3.50.

Pange, Jean de, *Le Roi Tres Chretien*. Librairie Artheme Fayard. pp. 448.
475 francs.

Scullard, H. H., *Roman Politics, 220-150 B. C.* Oxford Univ. Pr. pp. 336.
\$6.00.

Webster, Thomas B., *Greek Terracottas*. Penguin Bks. pp. 89. \$0.75.

Yontie, Herbert C., and Winter, John G., eds., *Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis*. Michigan Univ. Pr. pp. 299. \$4.00.

MODERN

Albjerg, Victor L., and Mrs. Marguerite H., *Europe from 1914 to the Present*. McGraw-Hill. pp. 868. \$5.50.

Alpert, Paul, *Twentieth Century Economic History of Europe*. Schuman. pp. 478. \$6.00.

Beck, F. and Godin, W., *Russian Purge and the Extraction of Confession*. Viking. pp. 287. \$3.50.

Betts, Reginald R., ed., *Central and South East Europe, 1945-1948*. Royal Institute of International Affairs. pp. 237. \$3.50.

Blackman, Raymond V., ed., *Jane's Fighting Ships, 1950-1951*. McGraw-Hill. pp. 534. \$20.00.

Boak, Hyma, and Slosson, *Growth of Western Civilization*. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. pp. 880. \$6.00.

Fourth edition. Bibliographies brought up to date. New maps and illustrations. Text gives more emphasis to the part U. S. plays in Western civilization.

Boxer, Charles R., *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549-1650*. California Univ. Pr. pp. 550. \$7.50.

Butterfield, Herbert, *The Whig Interpretation of History*. Scribner. pp. 188. \$1.50

Bryant, Arthur, *The Age of Elegance, 1812-1822*. Harper. pp. 450. \$4.50.

Curtis, Edmund, *A History of Ireland*. Barnes & Noble. pp. 445. \$5.00.

D'Aubigne, *The Life and Times of Martin Luther*. Moody Press. pp. 559. \$3.50.

*Davitt, Thomas E., S.J., *The Nature of Law*. Herder. pp. 274. \$4.00.

de Ford, Miriam A., *Who Was When*. Wilson. \$6.00.

Ehrsam, Theodore G., *Major Byron; the Incredible Career of a Literary Forger*. Charles S. Boesen. pp. 217. \$6.00.

Ellis, Havelock, *The Genius of Europe*. Rinehart. pp. 296. \$3.00.

Falls, Cyril, *Elizabeth's Irish Wars*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 351. \$5.75.

Farmer, Paul, *The European World*. Knopf. pp. 669. \$5.00.

Frazer, W. M. *A History of English Public Health*. Williams & Wilkins. pp. 498. \$7.00.

Friedmann, Wolfgang G., *An Introduction to World Politics*. Macmillan. pp. 325. \$2.25.

*Gottschalk, Louis, *Understanding History*. Knopf. pp. 290. \$2.50.

Hall, Walter P. and W. S. Davis, *Course of Europe since Waterloo*. Appleton-Century-Crofts. pp. 1083. \$5.50.

Third edition. Bibliographies brought up to date and eleven new maps supplied.

Hervy, John H., *Lord Hervey and His Friends, 1726-38*. Transatlantic Arts. pp. 333. \$5.00.

Hoffman, Ross J., *The Spirit of Politics and the Future of Freedom*. Bruce. pp. 98. \$2.50.
 Amplified text of the inaugural Gabriel Richard Lecture.

Holborn, Hajo, *The Political Collapse of Europe*. Knopf. pp. 218. \$2.50.

Hyamson, Albert M., *Palestine Under the Mandate, 1920-1948*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 219. \$3.25.

James, David H., *The Rise and Fall of the Japanese Empire*. Macmillan. pp. 409. \$5.00.

Leaf, Horace, *Iceland Yesterday and Today*. Macmillan. pp. 205. \$3.50.

Major, J. Russell, *The Estates General of 1560*. Princeton. pp. 154. \$2.50.

Manning, Clarence A., *Twentieth-Century Ukraine*. Bookman Associates. pp. 243. \$3.50.

Maritain, Jacques, *Man and the State*. Chicago Univ. Pr. pp. 229. \$3.50.

Mosse, George L., *Struggle for Sovereignty in England*. Michigan State College Pr. pp. 191. \$2.50.

Oliver, Douglas L., *The Pacific Islands*. Harvard Univ. Pr. pp. 323. \$5.00.

Opie, Redvers et al., *The Search for Peace Settlements*. Brookings Institute. pp. 383. \$4.00.

Pear, T. H., ed., *Psychological Factors of Peace and War*. Philosophical Libr. pp. 262. \$4.75.
 A symposium of nine psychologists on how to avoid war.

Polimeni, Emmanuela, *Léon Bloy*. Philosophical Libr. pp. 119. \$2.75.

*Sedillot, René, *The History of the World in Three Hundred Pages*; tr. by Gerard Hopkins. Harcourt. pp. 320. \$2.95.

Spear, Percival, *Twilight of the Mughuls*. Cambridge Univ. Pr. pp. 279. \$3.75.

*Strathmann, Ernest A., *Sir Walter Raleigh*. Columbia. pp. 292. \$3.75.

Walsh, W. H., *Introduction to Philosophy of History*. Hutchinson's Univ. Libr. pp. 173. \$2.00.

*Wolf, John B., *The Emergence of the Great Powers*. Harper. pp. 336. \$5.00.

World's Great Events. Collier. 10 Vols. Collier. \$29.00.

Zeuner, Frederick E., *Dating the Past*. Longmans. pp. 516. \$5.50.

AMERICAN

*Abell, Aaron I., et al., *A History of the United States of America*. McMullen. pp. 652.

Baym, Max Isaac, *The French Education of Henry Adams*. Columbia Univ. Pr. pp. 372. \$5.00.

*Beirne, Francis F., *The Amiable Baltimoreans*. Dutton. pp. 400. \$5.00.

Bivins, Viola C., *Echoes of the Confederacy*. Bivins. \$3.50.

Blanksten, George I., *Ecuador: Constitutions and Caudillos*. California Univ. Pr. pp. 208. \$3.00.

Bowen, Richard Le Baron, *Index to the Early Records of the Town of Providence*. Rhode Island Historical Society. pp. 109. \$6.00.

Brand, Donald D., and Corona Nunez, José, *Quiroga, A Mexican Municipio*. Govt. Pr. Office. pp. 282. \$1.75.

Briggs, Harold E., *Frontiers of the Northwest*. Peter Smith. pp. 629. \$5.00.

Brown, Everett S., *The Territorial Delegate to Congress*, and other essays. George Wahr. Pub. Co. pp. 192. \$3.00.

Carlson, Theodore L, *The Illinois Military Tract*. Illinois Univ. Pr. pp. 225. \$3.50.

Carr, Robert K., et al., *American Democracy in Theory and Practice*. Rinehart. pp. 1107. \$5.00.

Carson, James H., *Recollections of the California Mines*. Cal. Centennial Eds. pp. 120. \$10.00.

Casey, Robert J., and Douglas, William A., *The Lackawanna Story*. McGraw-Hill. pp. 223. \$4.00.

Casner, Mabel B., and Gabriel, Ralph H., *The story of American Democracy*. Harcourt. pp. 649. \$3.32.

Chandler, Lester V., *Inflation in the United States, 1940-1948*. Harper. pp. 413. \$6.00.

Christopher Columbus; a Selected List of Books and Articles by American Authors or Published in America 1892-1950. Library of Congress. pp. 41.

Craven, Avery Y. et al., *A Documentary History of the American People*. Ginn. pp. 894. \$5.50.

Davidson, Levette J., *A Guide to American Folklore*. Denver Univ. Pr. pp. 143. \$2.00.

de Grummond, Jane L., *Envoy to Caracas*. Louisiana State Univ. Pr. pp. 237. \$3.75.

Edmonds, Helen G., *The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901*. North Carolina Univ. Pr. pp. 268. \$5.00.

*Ellis, Lewis E., *A Short History of American Diplomacy*. Harper. pp. 614. \$5.00.

Emory, Lieutenant W. H., *Lieutenant Emory Reports*. New Mexico Univ. Pr. pp. 208. \$4.50.

*Gannon, David, S A., *Father Paul of Graymor*. Macmillan. pp. 372. \$4.00.

Garcilasco de la Vega, el Inca, *The Florida of the Inca*. Texas Univ. Pr. pp. 700. \$7.50.

Goodwyn, Frank, *Life on the King Ranch*. Crowell. pp. 293. \$5.00

Gosnell, Cullen B., and Holland, L. M. *State and Local Government in the United States*. Prentice-Hall. pp. 635. \$6.65; text ed., \$5.00.

Gray, James, *The University of Minnesota, 1851-1951*. Minnesota Univ. Pr. pp. 626. \$3.75.

Griffin, Clarence W., *Essays on North Carolina History*. Forest City Courier. pp. 299. \$4.25.

Harlow, Neal, *The Maps of San Francisco Bay*. Bk. Club of Cal. pp. 140. \$30.00.

Hyde, George E., *Pawnee Indians*. Denver Univ. Pr. pp. 304. \$7.50.

Jillson, Willard R., *Books on Kentucky Books and Writers*. Roberts Pr. Co. pp. 27. \$2.25.

*Kelsey, Vera, *Red River Runs North!* Harper. pp. 315. \$3.75.

Knight, Edgar W., *Education in the United States*. Ginn. pp. 783. \$4.50.

Lambert, Oscar D., *West Virginia and Its Government*. Heath. pp. 501. \$4.50.

Lane, Raymond A., D.D., *The Early Days of Maryknoll*. McKay. pp. 319.
\$3.00.

McKay, Donald C., *The United States and France*. Harvard. pp. 351. \$4.00.

Morris, Maud B., and Schmeckebier, Laurence F., *Records of the Columbia Historical Society*. Columbia Historical Soc. pp. 54. \$2.50.

Mugridge, Donald H., *American History and Civilization*. Library of Congress. pp. 18. Gratis to libraries.

List of guides and bibliographies.

Pictorial History of Northwestern University, 1851-1951. Northwestern Univ. Pr. pp. 198. \$3.50; de luxe ed. \$7.50.

Rodgers, Andrew D., *Bernard Eduard Fernow*. Princeton. pp. 623. \$7.50.

Royer, Fanchon, *The Franciscans Came First*. St. Anthony Guild Pr. pp. 206. \$2.50.

Smith, Charles W., *Pacific Northwest Americana*. Binfords & Mort. pp. 381. \$15.00.

Smith, Jesse Guy, *Heroes of the Saddle Bags*. Naylor. pp. 243. \$2.75.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

A Jesuit Institution

Founded 1818



"Democracy is built upon the bedrock of Christian education . . ."

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

- Labor College
- School of Law
- Graduate School
- School of Divinity
- School of Nursing
- School of Dentistry
- School of Medicine
- Institute of Technology
- School of Social Service
- Institute of Social Science
- College of Arts and Sciences
- School of Philosophy and Letters
- School of Commerce and Finance
- Parks College of Aeronautical Technology

CORPORATE COLLEGES

- Webster College
- Maryville College
- Fontbonne College
- St. Mary's Junior College
- Notre Dame Junior College

Saint Louis University owns and operates

Radio Station WEW

Saint Louis 3

Missouri